

A DIALOGUE

BETWEEN

A Christian and a Quaker:

WHEREIN

Is Faithfully Represented, some of the
Chief and most Concerning

OPINIONS
OF THE
QUAKERS.

Together with their Method and Manner
of Reasoning in the Defence thereof.

Published for Common Benefit by *T. Hickey*.

The Second Edition Corrected and Amended.

1 Tim. 3. 16. *All Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for Doctrine, for Reproof, for Correction, for Instruction in Righteousness.*

Cap. 2. 17, 18. *And their words eat like a Canker, of whom is Hymeneus and Philetus; who concerning the Truth have erred, saying, The Resurrection is past already, overthrowing the faith of some.*

Cap. 3. 8. *Now as Jannes and Jambres withstood Moses, so do these also resist the Truth, Men of corrupt Minds, Reprobates concerning the Faith.*

LONDON:

Printed for *Henry Hills*, and are to be sold by *Peter Parker*, at the Leg and Star in Cornhil. 1673.



Jackson fund



*A true Account of some of the
cheif Opinions of the Quakers, toge-
ther with their Method and Manner of
Reasoning in the defence thereof; faith-
fully represented in a Dialogue between
a Christian and a Quaker.*

Christian.



Ell met Neighbor, I should
be glad to have some dis-
course with you, for I hear
you hold dangerous Errors.

Quaker These are lies and
slanders, I know no dangerous
Errors owned amongst us.

Chr. It is said you deny the *Authority* of the Holy
Scriptures as the Rule of *Faith*, and practise unto
Christians; and that you deny the *Person* of *Jesus Christ*,
and the Resurrection of the *Body*; and that you main-
tain that the *Light* in every *Man* is sufficient to guide
unto Salvation, not onely such as are without the writ-
ten Law and Gospel but as well such as have; and also
that *Perfection* is attainable in this life.

Qua. This is false, We deny not the *Scriptures*, nor the
Person of *Christ*, nor the Resurrection of the dead; but in-
deed it is true, We do affirm the light in every man is suf-

A Dialogue between

ficient (if heeded) to guide unto Salvation, and likewise we hold Perfection.

Chr. I should be glad if what thou sayst be true, That you deny not the Scripture, nor the Person of Christ, &c.

Qu. It is very true, and it is nothing but Envy and Darknes that suggests the contrary of us.

Chr. We will refer the debate of those Points till afterwards, but forasmuch as thou dost affirm the *light* in every man, to be sufficient, if obeyed, to bring to Salvation; Let us (if you please) speak a little to that, for I am not satisfied in the truth of it.

Qu. Dost thou indeed want information in this matter, or is it only to cavil?

Chr. Truly not to cavil, but that I may understand the truth; for if this opinion of thine can be demonstrated to be, what thou sayest it is, I shall be very ready and willing to subscribe to it.

Qu. I doubt not in the least of it, but do and shall stand by it as a certain truth.

Chr. That our time then may be improved to advantage in the disquisition of this Point, it will be necessary to examine it in Parts. There are three things in it.

1. An end, (*viz.*) Salvation. 2. The way and means of attaining this end; Obedience to the *light within*. 3. Who shall attain this end, He or They that obey this *light within*.

I would desire to know (1) What this Salvation is? and (2) What this *light* is? (3) Who this *He* or *They* are, that do obey this *light*, and in obeying, attain Salvation?

Qu. Thou runnest into many words and carnal distinctions, and wouldest have thy fleshy wisdom satisfied, but I tell thee that Dust is the Serpents Food.

Chr.

a Christian and a Quaker.

Chr. I intreat thee be not angry, but give me (if thou canst) a direct and pertinent answer to these questions, what can be of nearer concernment to every Man, then to understand aright what his utmost and last end is; and what is the best way and means conducing thereunto: Be free therefore, and let me know what this Salvation is?

Qu. *It is God, when we say it will bring to Salvation, we intend it will bring to God.*

Chr. Very well. In the next place; Pray tell me, what this *light within* is?

Qu. *It is the Light of God. It is a Measure of Christ. It is of the Divine Essence; yea, it is the Divine Essence.*

Chr. You express your selves with great variety. Sometimes you say it is Christ; another time it is onely a Measure of Christ: One while it is the Divine Essence, and anon it is onely of the Divine Essence. This is a very uncertain sound. But if thou sayest, that this Light in every Man is Christ and God. I do not onely deny it, but charge it with Blasphemy. God knoweth all things, so doth not the light in thee. God cannot deceive, nor be deceived; but thou mayest both deceive, and be deceived, notwithstanding thy most diligent attendance to the light in thee: Yea, that which thou calls the light in thee, hath in many things misguided thee, &c.

Qu. *Who of us ever said, the light within every Man is God?*

Chr. George Whitehead in his Discourse upon this point, urged that Text, John 1. 4. *In him was life, and the life was the light of Men.* If the life (said he) be the Divine Essence, the light must be so also; for, such as the cause is, such the effect must be. From this

kind of reasoning, we may conclude not onely the *light within*, but every *Creature*, both *Beasts* and *Trees* are God. These being effects of infinite Wisdom and Power. Dost thou not tremble at this consequence?

Qa. But, George Whitehead did explain himself, and told thee, that the immediate effect must be such as the cause is.

Chr. Then it seems George Whitehead is not so infallible, but he must make use of *Meanings* to help himself at a dead list, though this will not do it. For, if this be true, then the *Natural light*, the *Firmament*, the *Sun*, the *Earth*, and the *Waters* must be God. Being the immediate effects of an Almighty creating word, *Gen. 1. 3, 6, 9, 14.* But is not this blasphemy?

Again, G. W. affirmed, *The light within must be God*, because (said he) to deny it so to be, is to deny the *Omnipresence of God*. Then it seems that the *light within*, and the *Omnipresence of God* is one and the same thing with him. Is this your Champion? may we not conclude the *Body of Man*, as well as the *light within* him, to be God, by this reason? Further, to give George his due, he offered one reason more why it must needs be so. That the *light within* is God, which was this.

The Divine life (saith he) *is immutable*. To say then the *light within* is not God, is to say God is mutable. Therefore concludes, *It is blasphemy to deny the light within to be God.*

If G. W. were not more then ordinarily infatuated in his understanding. He could never imagine that this Argument doth conclude the Point in question: For though it be granted, that God is an Infinite, Immutable, and perfect Being. Will it therefore follow,
that

a Christian and a Quaker.

that every thing he creates and communicates is his own Being. What Man but a Quaker would dare to affirm this?

Qu. Art thou sure thou dost not mistake George Whitehead?

Chr. I am sure these were his very words. Not is he singular herein. There is a Pamphlet lately published by Robert VVest a Quaker, Intituled, *Damnable Heresie discovered*. Wherein he arraignes and condemnes (as guilty of *Damnable Heresie*) viz. *The denying to worship the measure of light in every man*. Many Quakers that read this particular in that Book, condemn'd it, and censur'd the person that asserted it, whence I conclude, that both he and they believe the light within is God. Otherwise to worship it would be Idolatry. And because Robert VVest would have us believe that herein he is not mistaken, He (*Quaker-like*) tells us in that Book, p. 6. *The Spirit which God breathed into Adam, was not mans spirit, but another, which he calls the Breath of our nostrills, The Anointed Lord* quoting (though wretchedly profaning and perverting) that Text, Lam 4. 20. and concludes *This is that true light which lighteth every man that comes into the world*. What can more rationally be infer'd from hence then this, *That the light in every man is God*. For as much as he affirms this light communicated unto Adam, was not onely Gods Gift to him, but also the Fountain whence all that light proceeds. Which is imparted or communicated to the creature: But, Darest thou stand by this Assertion?

Qu. I see thou catchest at VVords. But this I do say and believe, that the light in every man is Christ.

Chr. Is this Christ within God or a Creature? If

A Dialogue between

God, then it is the same with what was said before. If a *Creature*, then it is no *Heretic*, much less damnable *Heretic* to affirm, that they who worship this measure of light in every Man, are Idolaters, for as much as they worship a *Creature*? Which of these two is it?

Qu. We all say the light within is *Christ*, or a measure of *Christ*.

Chr. But why do you boggle; wherefore do you not speak plainly what it is. Whether *Christ*, or onely a *Measure of Christ*.

Qu. Thou art not to teach us what we should say.

Chr. Though you will not be taught what to say, yet you ought to speak honestly what it is you believe concerning this matter, especially it being your first and grand principle.

Qu. We have spoke plain enough already: That it is *Christ*, or a *Measure of Christ*.

Chr. I perceive you think it is something or other: But, whether it is safest for you to say, It is *Christ*, or onely a *Measure of Christ*, there you are at a loss, being apprehensive of those inconveniencies that may attend either Assertion. Which by the way, let me tell thee, that thy light is very imperfect, For as much as it hath not yet instructed thee by what name to call it, Whether *Christ*, or onely a *Measure or Gift of Christ*. But, if thou say it is *Christ*, I expect proof; for to assert this upon thy own Authority, signifies nothing to me.

Qu. Doth not the Scriptures say, *Christ is in you*, and that he is the life and light of Men.

Chr. I see then (though you deny the Scriptures to be the Rule) yet at a pinch, you do and must have recourse to them, else all the light you have would fail,

a Christian and a Quaker.

as to the concluding this point. However, the Scripture saith not that Christ is in every Man: For, if he were, then the Apostle did needlessly exhort the *Corinthians* to examine themselves, whether Christ was in them or no, there can be no reason we should prove our selves in this case, for (if your opinion be true) Christ is certainly in every man in the World.

To the other Text I grant, that every man is *in-lightened*, hath a *light* in them, but this doth not prove that this *light* in every man is *Christ*, nor yet sufficient (of it self) to guide to Salvation.

Qu. *wilt thou say that Christ is not sufficient?*

Chr. Christ is sufficient. But, I say, the light in every Man is not sufficient to the end aforelaid, if thou canst prove that, let me hear it?

Qu. *I will prove that it is the special gift of Gods grace, and is sufficient to heale, help, and save them that take heed to it, and thus I prove it. If it ought to be obey'd, then it must be sufficient, &c.*

Chr. This was the utmost that *Crisp* (one of your Ministry) did say for the proof hereof. But I appeale to the *light* in thee whether this be not an insufficient proof. I grant it ought to be obey'd, so ought the lawful commands of Magistrates, Parents, and Masters, yet who will thence infer, that therefore they are a sufficient rule to Salvation. If then thou canst propose any thing farther to establish thy Assertion, go on.

Qu. *I think what I have said is sufficient.*

Chr. This was *Crisps* reply: but, whether it be so, let any man judge. If thou hast any thing to say, that is more cogent and convincing, let me hear it.

Qu. *Art*

A Dialogue between

Qu. Art thou come to bear witness against the light of the world?

Chr. No; but I do and must (if true to the light in me) bear witness against thy absurd, and erroneous opinion concerning this light in every man, that it is *Christ*, and sufficient of it self to guide every man to salvation.

Qu. Thou bear witness! alas for thee, what is thy witness worth?

Chr. Is this reply argumentative, yea, is it not designed to divert from the matter in controversie? I say again, if thou canst evince the truth of thy position, I am willing to hear thee, if thou canst not be free and tell me.

Qu. Is there not something in thee that checks thee when thou dost amiss, and also prompts thee to that which is good; tis that of God in thee, to which if thou wouldst be obedient, it would lead thee out of thy questionings, and out of the Evil into the Truth.

Chr. I acknowledge there is something within that checks for many evils, and excites to many good things. And that I ought to shun those evils, and to do that good. But what is all this to the question; doth this prove the Light within to be *Christ*, and sufficient of it self to guide to Salvation?

Qu. If that which checks for evils done, and provokes to good, be not a sufficient rule, what can be?

Chr. Though there be many sins which this Light reproveth, yet there are some sins, it reproveth not; and also many Duties it discovers not, consequently no sufficient rule. Did the Light in *Saul* reprove him for persecuting the Church? doth not he himself confess, that he verily thought, he ought to do many things against the name of *Jesus of Nazareth*; yea, doth not
Christ

Christ tell his Disciples, that some would kill them, and yet think they did God service. But how could they think so, if the Light in them did reprove for it? Did the Light in the Heathen Philosophers check them for multiplying their Deities, and for not believing that *Jesus* is the *Christ*; or did it reprove them for their manifold superstitions? or were they by it directed to the right way of worshipping the true God. I demand an instance amongst the many thousands of mankind that have been convinced or reprov'd, for not believing *Jesus* to be the *Christ*, by the meer Light within, before any Light of Revelation was brought unto them.

And though I grant that the Light in thee may reprove for those sins, the common Light in all mankind will not, because thou hast borrowed much Light from the Scriptures which all have not; yet I would ask thee whether thy light doth reprove thee for thy undervaluing thoughts of *Jesus Christ*, God Man, as a Person without thee. And for accounting that blood which was spilt at *Ierusalem*, no more then of an unholy or common thing. And for casting off the Institutions of *Jesus Christ*, and therein rejecting his Authority and Sovereignty over thee; if it do, then are you as vile wretches as the Earth bears, because you so openly and wilfully sin against your light; but if it do not, then either these are no sins, or thy light is an insufficient rule.

Qu. To say we undervalue *Jesus Christ*, or cast off his Institutions, are lies and slanders, for we do acknowledge *Christ*, and do obey the Commands of the living and eternal word in us.

Chr. Methinks you that pretend to *Infallibility* and *Perfection*, should not be so lavish with your tongues,

to speak so unadvisedly. Is this a lie to say you slight the Person of Christ without you, and cast off his Institutions? Let all Men that know you judge: 'Tis true, you say, that you own Jesus Christ, but then 'tis with such a mental, and mystical Reservation, which is indeed no other then (as one saith) a meer mystical Romance. Is there any other object of your Faith but the *light within*. But is this *light within* that very *Saviour* and *Mediator* the Scripture speaks of? Is this *light within* the surety of the Covenant? if not then 'tis not the Christ, if it be, wherein doth it the office of a surety? What hath it undertaken for us, and, What are those Promises the Father hath made to it?

And whether all power in Heaven and Earth is given to this *light within*, so as to have Sovereign Rule and Dominion over all Creatures, visible and invisible. Be plain and sincere, who or what that is which you acknowledge to be the true Christ? Is it not the *light within*? if it be, then are you not guilty of most wretched deceit and equivocation, in pretending to own one thing, yet secretly intend another?

Qua. *Thou wrongest me and our friends, for we deny deceit, that is with thee, we speak and mean honestly, but thou in thy ignorant and dark mind cannot understand us.*

Chr. 'Tis thy own error and deceit that wrongs thee, all I intend, is only thy conviction and recovery, which endeavour (I think) might very well have escaped such a severe reflection, but since thou art so peremptory, that this *light* is the *true Christ*, let me ask thee a few questions.

1. Why the Holy Men amongst the Jews, and the wise men amongst the Greeks never called this *light* by this

this name, for many thousand years? and why is it said none of the Princes of this world knew Jesus Christ, since at the same time they did acknowledge a *light* to be in all Men? or is any thing more evident then that by the *light within* they understood one thing, and by *Jesus Christ* another.

2. That Jesus of whom the *Scriptures* speak was one, of whom there was many types both personal and real. If the *light within* be the true Christ, Then who are those Persons, and what are those things that were types of it?

3. Jesus Christ was a person of whom there were many Prophecies which should be fulfilled in him, That he should be born of a Virgin, hence called the seed of a Woman; be born at *Bethlem*; should be of the Tribe of *Judah*; and that he should be cut off, not for himself, &c. I Query how all these Prophecies are fulfilled in this *light within*? Is this *light within* that seed of the Woman? and the seed of *Abraham*, and of the Tribe of *Judah*? born at *Bethlem*; if you affirm this, then why is it called the Seed of the Woman, and the seed of *Abraham*, rather then of *Lot*? and, How is it of the Tribe of *Judah*, and not of *Reuben* or *Levi*, &c. and, Whether it was ever cut off?

4. Jesus Christ was a man approved of God by miracles, wonders and signs, which God did by him, *Act. 2. 22. This very Jesus hath God made both Lord and Christ*, vers. 36. what those miracles were, we have many undoubted instances, and that one great end thereof was to prove him to be the *Messiah* Promised: if then the *light within* every man be the true and only *Messiah*, What are those miracles, wonders, and signs that are wrought by it, to prove it so to be?

That

That which any of you have as yet said in answer hereunto hath been no more, then what the Apostle speaks of the Man of Sin, whose coming is after the working of Satan, with all Power, Signs, and Lying wonders, *2 Thes. 2. 9.* And also what may as well prove *Mahomet* to be the true Christ, as the *light* in you.

5. The Scripture saith, *on him* (that is Christ) *was laid the Iniquities of us all, He bore our sins, was a man of sorrows, and that his soul was made an offering for sin.* I Query how all this can be affirmed of the *light within*? Was this *light* ever made a curse for us? Was our Iniquities laid upon it? or was it ever cut off, that thereby it might bring in everlasting righteousness?

6. If this *light within* be the true and onely Christ, Then why was there so many sacrifices in the time of the Law typifying Christ to come? since *Moses* and the rest of the children of *Israel* had a *light* in them; if you say that *light* in them was not the *Messiah*, then you deny your principle; if it were, what significancy could be in those Types respecting Christ to come, forasmuch, as he was then truly and properly in them?

7. And since eternal life is promised to them only (I speak as to grown persons under the Gospel) that acknowledge and believe in the true Christ. I Querie, whether all the generations of Christians since Christs time, till within these very few years, be not certainly lost and damned, forasmuch as they acknowledged not this *light within*, as the true Christ.

And whereas thou sayest this *light within* is a sufficient rule, I would ask of thee, Whether thou believest that God doth any thing in vain? if not; then since he hath been pleased, (notwithstanding this *light within*) to superadd by Divine Revelation other rules by Jesus Christ and his Holy Apostles. To

neg-

neglect which is both dangerous and damnable; If then, I say, what God hath done herein is not vain and needless, it will necessarily follow, that this meer *light within* is no sufficient rule. Therefore it will be our wisdom, yea our duty, not onely to attend to the *light within*, but especially to those *Revelations* of Gods mind and will in the Holy Scriptures; we being accountable for every dispensation of light, according to its kind and degree; Whether common light (that which thou calls the light in every man) The written Law. And also the Gospel.

But the farther debate hereof I shall referr to our discourse concerning the Scriptures. At present I conceive enough hath been said, to evince that the *light* in every man neither is the true Christ, nor a sufficient rule to guide us to Salvation.

Qu. I see thou art a poor dark creature, I pitty thee, thy mind is without to a body and person, to written words and letters, but we witness the life and power in our selves, which thou knowest nothing of, as by thy talking is manifest, yea 'tis manifest in the light.

Chr. How forcible are right words, But what doth this arguing reprove. I shall proceed to the next question (*viz.*) who or what it is that obeys this light, and in obeying of it be saved? For if this light be the rule; It doth suppose a subject capable of understanding it, and of yielding obedience to it. Who or what is it?

Qu. Thou art drunk with words, and carnal distinctions, I know not what thou wouldst be at.

Chr. More the pity, that thou and others of thy Perswasion should so furiously contend for this thing; And yet when desired to open and explain it to us, tell us you know not what we would be at; Do such replies

teplies credit you, or your cause? If indeed thou knowest not what I aime at in this question, then thy light cannot be God, as thou sayest it is, for God knows the hearts and intentions of all men. Dost thou not see here how thou contradicts thy self? It appears to me that this opinion of thine is clog'd with such absurdities, that all the light thou hast knows not how to remove them, which was not consider'd by thee, when first thou espous'd this fancy; yet being proud, and not willing to fall under conviction, answer such as would shew thee thy folly and error, with scornful and invective speeches.

Qu. Thou art a wicked creature, Blackness of darkness is reserv'd for thee.

Chr. Was not my question plain and familiar? but, Is this answer pertinent? Is it not needful we should be informed who must obey this light? I therefore ask this Question, because many of your Ministry (as they are called) affirm, There is but *one light* in every man; if so, and this be the *Rule*; what then is the Principle? either the light must obey it self, or darkness must obey it; That it should obey it self is not to be suppos'd, for how can it be both the Rule and Subject. That darkness should obey it cannot be imagin'd; for, where a Rule is, there must be light and understanding in the Subject yielding obedience, otherwise it cannot be reasonable or acceptable service. Then there must be another light in every Man to render him capable of this obedience to the Supream and commanding light. If this be granted, there must be two lights in every man. But, how this will be proved I yet see not.

Qu. Thou art a Serpent, and the Curse of God is eternally upon thee.

Chr. This

Chr. This Language is so natural to you, that it is as difficult for you to leave it, as for the *Ethiopian* to change his skin. But wherein can such a reply as this contribute to my satisfaction, about the matter in question? If thou canst inform me who is the Subject of this obedience, I would gladly hear it. Is it the whole person, or onely a part, or is it any thing else?

Qu. *Thou manifestst thy darkness, and that thou art still in the Imagination.*

Chr. What need these impertinencies.

Qu. *I comprehend thee, and see the Serpents subtilty in these questions. Thou art out of the truth, and drunk with words.*

Chr. Either thou canst, or thou canst not answer me. If not, be so free and honest as to tell me so. If thou canst, pray then let me know who it is, Whether the whole person, or part, or something else?

Qu. *I deny thy person, thou speaks thou knowest not what.*

Chr. If it be not the whole person, then who, or what else is it?

Qu. *I say they are foolish questions.*

Chr. Shew me the folly thereof.

Qu. *Thou look'st for words, but thy flesh must be silenced.*

Chr. By these answers, I suspect thy ignorance and perverseness in this matter.

Qu. *Alas! for thee, I very well know what it is, but should I acquaint thee, thou couldst not understand, for I see the darkness that covers thee.*

Chr. I intreat thee let not this serve for a full answer; but, if thou dost know, inform me, who, or what it is?

Qu. *I say it is a Seed. And if thou wouldst in the meekness wait in the light, thou mightest know what it is.*

Chr. Some of you call this *Seed*, a Measure of God, others of you say it is Christ, and the Spirit. If this be it that must obey the light, then thy tenent is (to me) unintelligible. For, if that which obeys, be onely the Seed, and this seed be the light, then this seed or light must obey it self, and in so doing be saved. If the whole person ought to obey this light, then would the whole person be concerned in this salvation. But this you cannot intend, for as much as you deny the *Resurrection* of this Body. Truly I see so much falshood and equivocation in thee, and such absurdity and inconsistency in thy opinion, that it will be to no purpose to urge this question any farther upon thee.

Qu. *Thou lier, wilt thou run away with a lie in thy mouth, I know very well these things, yea, I witness them, but thou in thy blind and dark imagination, canst not understand.*

Chr. If thou dost know, Why dost thou not acquaint me? Is it the *seed* that obeys, or is it the Soul in which you say the light is set up? Or, What is it?

Qu. *It is the Soul that must and ought to obey the light.*

Chr. This answer seems more plausible, yet if I may interpret it by those fancies and conceits you have of the Soul, there is as much absurdity, nonsense, and error in it, as in saying the seed must obey?

Qu. *Why sayest thou so?*

Chr. Because *George Fox* (whom you esteem as an infallible Man) tells me in his Book, entituled, *The Great Mystery*. &c. p. 68. & 100 *That the Soul is part of God, and of Gods being, and that it is without beginning,* p. 91. and also *infinite*, p. 29. All which is as much as to say, the Soul is God. If this be so, then thy opinion must be understood thus. God sets up a light in himself, which he himself is to obey, and in so doing, he shall

shall be saved. Dost thou not blush? Art thou not astonished at this folly? Could any Man that had not first offered violence to his own Reason and Light, be guilty of such madness as this is? From the Premises I do, and must conclude, That this (which thou accounts thy first and fundamental Principle) is a meer cheat, and palpable contradiction to it self.

The next thing I would enquire of thee, is this, Whether you indeed deny the Scriptures to be the Word of God, and the Rule of Faith, and practise unto Christians, as is commonly reported you do?

Qu. *We do deny the Scriptures to be the Word of God, and also to be a standing rule. See Fox and Hubberthorn in Truths Defence, p. 101.*

Chr. Let us (if thou please) discourse this point.

Qu. *It is the devil that contends for the Scriptures to be the Word of God. Thus Nailor in his Answer to the Jews, p. 22.*

Chr. We will examine that: For indeed I believe it is the devil that contends against the Scriptures as the Word of God.

Qu. *Is not Christ called the Word of God?*

Chr. How knowest thou that?

Qu. *Doth not the Scriptures say his name is the Word of God?*

Chr. Then it seems the Scriptures is the rule of thy belief in this point. Dost thou well then in denying it to be a Rule? I grant the Son of God is called the Word of God; yet this hinders not, but that the Scriptures may be called the Word of God: That is, his Mind and Will revealed to, and concerning Man.

Q. *Is there not many words of the devil and wicked men mentioned in the Scriptures? Wilt thou call these the Word of God?*

Chr. I perceive thou quarrelst this Title (of Word of God) being attributed to the Scriptures through a mistake, not considering the Scriptures in its several parts, viz. The Preceptive, Promisory, Threatning, and Historical parts. True, the sayings of the Devil and wicked men belong not to the Preceptive, or Promisory, yet they do to the Historical part: Was it not the Holy Pen-men, who were inspired to write the other parts that writ these? Are not these then part of Gods History? and also of great use to us. The Lord therein shewing the Malice and Subtilty, both of Devils and evil men against his people; notwithstanding which, the Alwise Providence over-ruled, and still did preserve his Church. Is there not a Book called *Speeds Chronicle*, wherein he speaks of persons and things in Being, long before he was born. Yet none scruple to call the Book by his name, because he relates those things to us. So here God hath by the Holy Pen-men given us this relation of the words of the Devil and wicked men. By whose name then shall this word be called.

Qu. I grant the Scriptures may be called the words, but not the Word of God.

Chr. Is any thing more evident throughout the Scriptures, then that a Collection of many words and sentences (in Prophecies, and Discourses of the Prophets, Christ, and the Apostles) are called the Word of God. Was not that word the *Pharisees* made void by their Traditions, the Fifth Commandment, wherein there are more words then one, yet called the Word of God. What Word of God is that called, *The sword of the Spirit*, Eph. 6. 17. Is the eternal and living Word as you mean, the Spirits Instrument? If not, What other word can it be, but the Doctrine of the Holy Scriptures, which the Spirit manageth to the good of the Souls of Men.

Further

Further, Doth not *George Fox* the younger, call many hundreds of Words by this single name, or term of a word. *A word* (saith he) *to the People of the World.* See the *Collection of his Books*, p. 57.

Qu. *I say we own them to be the words, but not the Word of God.*

Chr. I very much suspect your sincerity herein; so long as you will not acknowledge these words to be the Rule of your Faith and Practice: For, How can you own the Spirit, which (you say) gave forth the Scriptures, yet at the same time, reject the Scriptures with respect to that end for which they were given forth.

Qu. *We own the Scriptures, as a true Declaration of the Saints conditions, which conditions we witness. But thou makest a Profession of the Saints words, and in thy dark imagination runnest into their words [the Scriptures] and calls them the Word of God. And the Rule and way to know God. But what are those words to thee, if thou dost not witness the same Spirit? To this purpose see George Fox the younger, in the Collection of his Books, p. 59.*

Chr. You say you own the Scriptures as a Declaration of the Saints conditions: Is this all? What then signifie those standing Precepts? And also those many Promises and Prophecies which are therein recorded, and not yet fulfilled. Will you call these the Saints conditions? If not, Wherefore are they written? If not to oblige our Faith and Practice? Or will you say, That all those Commands expired with those Saints, and that all those Prophecies and Promises are useless, and never were intended to be the Grounds of Faith and Hope to any, but the Saints of that time. Be plain, Why are those Precepts, Prophecies, and Promises written, if not to oblige our Faith and Practice?

Qu. *We have a more perfect rule.*

Chr. *How shall I know that?*

Qu. *We witness it.*

Chr. *What is thy witnessing to me? Wherein doth that resolve my doubt? I will (though not granting yet) suppose thee to be a holy Man, would not the best thing in thee, be thy holiness; and whether holiness, as it is in the Creature, be not a Conformity to the Rule of Duty? If it be, then it cannot be the Rule. Is not the best and noblest principle that any Man can be acted by, Love to God and Jesus Christ? And whether this love be not a part of thy duty? If it be, then that cannot be the rule of thy duty. If then the best thing in thee cannot be the Rule, I presume the worst thing in thee is not, at least should not.*

Qu. *Poor Creature, thou runs to the Letter, takes up all from the Letter: But, what dost thou witness in thy self?*

Chr. *Why no better term then Letter? Do you speak so of your own Pamphlets? Some of which are called, The voice of Wisdom; others, A Testimony for God; others, The Breathings of true Love from the Immortal Seed, &c. Are you not ashamed to speak so contemptibly of the Scriptures, and yet give such Titles to your own Books? But to what thou sayest, give me leave to inform thee. That thou art in the Imagination, and dost flatter thy self in thy own fancies: For, we run not to the Letter, otherwise then to search out the Mind of God contained therein. And we desire to lie under the Authority of that Doctrine delivered to us in those Letters; believing that all things necessary to be believed and practised, with respect to eternal life, is contained in these holy Scriptures, and in no other Record in the World, either without or within Men; therefore I think it but reasonable to acknowledge the Will*

Will of God manifested in this written Word, to be the Rule.

Qu. Thou runs into the Imitation, takes up the Saints words, but if thou hast not the same spirit, what are these words to thee? and if thou hast that spirit, What need of these words?

Chr. Thy words imply, That the Spirit of God is not in all men, if so, then thy opinion concerning the sufficiency of the light in every man, cannot be true, if all men have not the Spirit?

2. They imply, That those who have the Spirit, need not these words; this is to impeach the Wisdom and Goodness of God, in causing so many needless words to be written,

3. If no need of these words, which you grant were given forth by the Spirit, then certainly there can be no need of your words, all you say and write, must be looked upon as useless to them who pretend to have the Spirit.

4. But though I should not have the Spirit in that measure the Saints of old had, I may not therefore deny the Scriptures to be a Rule. My having or not having the Spirit, cannot divest it of its Authority in being a Rule to me, since at the same time, as a Rule it directs me, How I may get the Spirit, if I have it not, and also how I may get more, if I have any measure of it.

Qu. If thou wou'dst listen to that of God in thy Conscience, it would direct thee.

Chr. That of God (as thou calls it) in my Conscience, is not sufficient meerly of it self, to direct me in those things needful to be known, believed, and practised, Nor is that of God in thy Conscience, sufficient to instruct thee, as will appear in a few instances.

(1.) If neither thou, nor any other of thy persuasion could understand any thing of *Adams Fall,*

how *Sin* and *Death* came in the world by that means, if by the Scriptures it had not been made known unto you; That *Adam* was not onely the first Man, but a publick head, representing all Mankind: Then not the meer light which every man in common hath, but the Scriptures is and must be the Rule of our belief in this point.

(2.) How could you have known there was such a person in the World as *Jesus Christ*, and that he suffered at *Jerusalem*, and rose again from the dead, if in the Scriptures this had not been revealed? Then not this meer light within, but that written Word must be the rule of your belief in this also. And if the being of such a person could not be known without the Revelations of God in the Scriptures, How then can propriety in such a person be known, without the help of the same Revelation, which makes him known to be. 'Tis not possible to believe a relation to, and interest in such a person, if first we know not whether ever such a person had a Being.

(3.) How could you call the Light within *Christ*, if some Scriptures had not mentioned *Christ* in you, and that he is the life and light of men? Give me an instance of any one person in the world (that never had acquaintance with the Scriptures) that ever called the Light in every man by this name; If none can be produced, then the Scriptures must be your rule for this.

(4.) How could you know that Swearing in any case were unlawful, if in the fifth of *Matthew* it had not been written, Swear not at all, which you think forbids all Swearing. Is not then that *Scripture* (though misinterpreted by thee) the rule of thy forbearing to swear?

(5.) How could you affirm we ought not to call any man Master? had it not been written, Call no man Master: Is not then that written word your rule in this case?

(6) If you your selves make it a rule for the neglect, ought

ought not others much more to acknowledge it as a rule for the doing of duty. You read there of some things called *Shadows* (which are the *Jewish Ceremonies*) from whence you argue against the Institutions of the Gospel, which fully satisfies me by what spirit you are guided, that doth so wretchedly and wickedly interpret the *Scriptures*. You pretend to deny meanings, but that must be understood onely of such as are true, because for perverse ones, none more abound with then you. I would seriously ask you, Whether there be not the same stamp of Divine Authority upon those things commanded to be done, as on them we are to forbear? Or whether you have a dispensation to pick and chuse, do and forbear what pleaseth you? if you say so, then indeed the *Scriptures* rule not you, but you rule them.

Do not you urge that Text, *1 Cor. 11. Do this till he come*, as the reason for the rejecting the Ordinance of breaking Bread? which by the way it will not be amiss to let thee know, that thy reasoning from thence carries in it a direct contradiction to your fundamental Tenent, which is, that Christ is in all Men. I see Liers have need of good memories, you say, *Do this till he come*, that is in you, which implies, first, That he is not in every man; secondly, And that he was not then in those *Corinthians*, so that a man may be a true Christian, and yet Christ not come in him. True Christians were commanded to do this till he come.

Further, when you are charged for denying the person of Christ, without you; do you not flie to the *2 Cor. 5. 16.* for refuge, *Though I have known Christ after the flesh, yet henceforth I know him so no more.* Is there any authority in that Text? If not, why do you plead it? If there be, oughtest thou not to be ashamed for perverting of it? Should the Apostle mean as you would

would have him, he would directly overthrow that Doctrine he had all along established in all his Epistles, wherein his main scope was to advance the Person of Jesus Christ as God Man. But you will say then, what doth *Paul* mean when he saith, *Henceforth I know him so no more*. May not this be his meaning? Though I *Paul* when a Jew, and in my unconverted State, onely knew Christ after a fleshly manner to be a King of the Jews, and to deliver onely from outward bondage and captivity, &c. Yet henceforth from the time of my conversion, I know him so no more, for now I know him according to that design of infinite Grace and Love, which he came to carry on in the world, in being a Saviour of sinners from Sin, Death, and Hell, which before I knew not, wherein then is this Text any way serviceable to your purpose?

Many more instances I could give; from these I conclude, that if the Scriptures wrested and taken in a quite other sence then they intend, be and is improved by you as a rule, without which you could no more discourse of these things then a meer Indian. Then that of God (as thou speakest) in thee is not sufficient to direct. And if the Scriptures perverted, (much more ought it in his native and proper sence) be acknowledged as a Rule. Is it then ingenious and honest in you to deny the Scriptures to be a rule to others, when at the same time you make it (though by misinterpreting of it) a Rule to your selves; are you not ashamed of this deceit, and self-condemned of plain partiality?

Qu. *Thou mistakest us, we own not the Scriptures to be our Rule, and whereas thou hast said many things to render us guilty of condemning this in others, whilst we our selves seemingly allow it to be so, which is but thy own imagination. For when we make use of the Scriptures,*

tures, 'tis onely to quiet and stop their clamours, that plead for it as their rule. But for us, had the Scriptures never been, we could have known what is therein contained.

Chr. As William Penn saith, the Proverb is, Give the Devil his due, so here indeed I must commend thee for thy plainness in speaking out, wherefore 'tis, you so much mention the Scriptures, not from any reverence or respect to its Authority, but only, if possible, to still the outcries of them that call for Scripture-proof; yet forasmuch as thou sayst, had not the Scriptures been, thou wouldst have known what is in them. 'Tis said, in *Iob. 21, 25.* There were many other things which Iesus did, which if they were written every one, I suppose the World would not contain the Books: pray tell me some of those things that were done, but are not written? otherwise this vain proud boast of thine is condemned to eternal silence.

Qu. Thou wouldst have thy flesh satisfied, but that must be silenced.

Chr. A pretty excuse of thy impudence, However, I do and shall take it for granted, that thou knowest not one of those things, and that this is but a presumptuous conceit of thy own, for if not Conscience, yet thy own credit would make thee speak out if thou couldst

Qu. I command thy flesh to be silent, I bear witness against thee.

Chr. Thy Commands and Witnessing are much alike to me, for I value neither, to deal plainly with thee, I fear there is a deep design of the Devil in this, that you do so strenuously endeavour to take people off the Scriptures.

Qu. Here thou art in the imagination, we deny designs.

Chr. If barely to deny would make a man innocent, there are but few would be guilty, you are famous (or rather infamous) for this, for you scruple not to deny your

your own words and positions, if you apprehend any inconvenience will attend the owning of them; nevertheless if thou wilt be patient, I wilt acquaint thee what my fears are, (*viz.*) That if once you could prevail with us to cast off the Scriptures, then might you pretend any Revelation or Message, though as ridiculous as *Mahomets*, and as false as any thing is true. And we should never know how to find out the cheat, for neither Scripture nor Reason (according to your conceits) must be made use of, the one being other mens words, and the other carnal; in this case, what security have we against Impostors, and every lying Enthusiast?

Then if *George Fox* do but say 'tis reveal'd to him the Earth is flat, it must be believ'd, because I have no rule wherewith to disprove his pretended Revelation; and if he shall suggest that there are not distinct Spirits, nor Angels, because he never saw any in the light, which certainly he should (as he thinks) if there were any, then in this, he must be believ'd, presuming, that if such Spirits there were, he should without all doubt have seen them, but he never did see any, therefore there is none, for such fancies I know *Foxes* brains have been troubled with.

I remember one of your party owing another Money, when it was demanded, answered the Creditor, 'Tis revealed to me, I owe thee nothing; thus by this device of a pretended Revelation, thy Friend would have cheated the other of his Money; but because this was not satisfactory, replied, *I thought thy flesh could not bear it*

Yea, how often have many of your selves been befooled and gulled by that which you call Revelation; I suppose the memory of that instance is not wholly obliterated, when some of you said it was revealed to them to go to such a place, and though many arguments

were

were used to dissuade them, they would not be prevailed with; but whence came that Revelation? but from *Paul Hobson* (who on purpose to try them) spake through a Trunck, yet could they not distinguish his voice from the immediate voice of God. *Thomas Holbrow* a Quaker in *Glocestershire*, said, he had a Message from God to deliver to *James Nobbs*, accordingly he came to the place where *James Nobbs* did use to meet, but so unhappily it fell out, that he delivers his message to another person instead of *Nobbs*, who was at that instant forty miles from the place: either this message was not from God, or else God knew not *James Nobbs*, nor where he was.

Another eminent Quaker Woman in *Bristol* (one *Marshall*) pretended she had a message from the Lord to deliver to *Tho. Mercer* at *Taunton*, and thither she goes to deliver it; but so it fell out, *Tho. Mercer* was then in *London*, and she was not aware of it. Oh horrid! that such sleeveless errands should be intitled upon the Divine Majesty.

This same Woman at another time when *Tho. Mercer* was in *Bristol*, he (hearing what she pretended) went to see her, she then told him it was revealed to her, That he was come to deny his Principles; then which nothing was more notoriously false, as he presently told her.

And above all that eminent difference may not be omitted, that was between *James Naylor*, and *George Fox*, at, or after *Naylor's* publick entrance into *Bristol*, when they called each other the Children of the Devil, and departed from the light; a great party adhered to both in this opposition of their Lights and Revelations: multitudes of instances in this kind I could give; by these we may see a necessity of a known Rule, or Standard, by which we may be preserved from such

Cheats

Cheats and Impostures ; but because the Scriptures, if diligently consulted with, would deter persons from believing your feigned Revelations ; therefore 'tis you so much endeavour to beget in the minds of Men, an ill opinion of them.

Qu. *This is a Lie, we own the Scriptures, and witness to them.*

Chr. You own them ; But how ? *As a Declaration of the Saints conditions*, not as a Rule of Faith and Practise ; you own them, but no more, nor so much as you do the speakings and writings of your Friends.

Qu. *Who didst thou ever hear say, that they esteemed not the Scriptures so much as the Speakings and Writings of our friends.*

Chr. *George Whitehead* being ask'd this question ; Do you esteem your speakings to be of as great Authority as any Chapter in the Bible ? answered (as he himself confesseth in his Apology, p. 49.) *That which is spoken from the spirit of Truth in any, is of as great Authority as the Scriptures, yea, and greater.* But How can that which is spoken by a *Quaker* (supposing though not granting, to be from the spirit of Truth) be of greater Authority then that which the Holy Spirit hath spoken in the *Scriptures* ? Why then are you so often forced (being not otherwise able) to make use of the *Scriptures*, to prove those things you pretend to be spoken from the spirit ? Doth the greater Authority usually stoop to the less, and submit it self to be try'd by it ?

Surely then if your pretences are to be examined by that Doctrine which is delivered to us in the *Scriptures*, and as the, agree or disagree therewith, to be received or rejected ; then this Dictate of *G. Whitehead* is not of such Authority as he imagines. Another of your Friends in *London* (whose name I could tell,

tell, but that I think it not convenient, she being a servant to another *Quaker*) who wondring her Master did not get some of their friends Books into the House, to which one reply'd, Can you not read the Bible? yes, said she, the Bible is a good honest thing, but I like our friends Books better. By this we may see how your Proselytes are taught.

Fox and Hubberthorne in a Book call'd *Truths Defence*, p. 101. say, *The Scriptures are no standing rule. And that 'tis dangerous for ignorant people to read them.* What could a Jesuit, or Romanist say more?

Thomas Holbrow (before mentioned) reasoning with *James Nobbs*, and his Wife; The said *James Nobbs* urging many *Scriptures* to him, *Holbrow* answered, *What dost thou tell me of the Scriptures, which are no better to me then an old Almanack.* By these instances 'tis easie to guess, and more then guess how you own the *scriptures*, whilst you boggle, and baffle simple minds with fair words and pretences.

Qu. *These are slanders, and lies, forg'd and brought forth in envy and darkness.*

Chr. This is your common refuge, which you think is sufficient to excuse you, and preserve your credit amongst them, who are instructed not to believe any thing (be it never so true) that tends to your disrepute, yet you must give us leave to believe our own eyes and eares: Though one while you have the confidence to speak and write thus; And another while the Impudence to deny it. This may not discourage us from giving a true account of what we hear from your own Mouths, and read in your own Books: Do you think such pittiful replies as these will convince us, either of your Perfection, or Infallibility.

Qu. *Thou art an Enemy, therefore what thou speaks concerning us is false.*

Chr. What?

Chr. What, Though I speak nothing but your own words, Are they no otherwise true then as immediately uttered by your selves? I remember *John Story* a noted *Quaker*, together with many others of your friends, when this Position was read to them, as their Tenent, *i. e.* *That the Light in every man is sufficient* (without any other Councillor) *to guide unto Salvation.* This was all that was read to them out of a Book wherein it was laid down: He the said *Story*, and the rest with him being asked, whether they owned this opinion? answer'd, they came not to be Catechiz'd; and that there might be some error in the Printer. I affirm'd this was their Tenent; and demanded which of them durst give me the Lye? They after some little pause reply'd, That was a lying Book. To which I return'd this answer; Then either this Opinion must be a lye, or 'tis a lie to say the *Quakers* hold any such thing; Which of these is it? They told me they came not to be Catechiz'd: But why were they so peremptory (think you) to speak thus? 'Twas because that Book was published by the Priests, yet whether the Priests (as they call them) did herein misreport their notion, I shall submit to the judgement of any that ever read the *Quakers* own Books.

In like manner, when some arguments were named, That *Turner* a *Quaker* had made use of against the Resurrection of this body, *George V Whitehead* took the liberty to say they were falsly reported; and why so, onely because an enemy to them had printed them, when yet I do affirm they were *Turners* own words.

Is this to approve your selves like honest Men, to give the lie, when nothing is said of you or your opinions, but what your selves have Printed, either then what you have said is truth, or it is not? if it be, why do you boggle thus, why will you
not

nor own it, be he friend or enemy that gives an account of it. If it be not true, why do you persist in it? May we not from this manner of dealing conclude, that the old Proverb is verified in you, *What is bred in the Bone, is hardly got out of the Flesh?* and that it is almost as possible for the Leopard to change his Spots, as for you to leave this accustomed evil.

But for as much as you do deny the Scriptures to be the Rule that Christians are to walk by.

I would ask you, whether they are to walk by any Rule? If not, then they must be Independent. And all their happiness, together with the way and means conducing thereunto must arise wholly from within themselves.

But if they must walk by Rule, it will then follow that there is a Rule, And indeed 'tis not to be deny'd but that Man was always under the obligation of a Rule. That Gods Sovereignty over him, and his Inferiority unto God might be acknowledg'd. To say this Rule must be the will of God revealed to us, I suppose thou wilt not deny; for 'tis the will of God which is the formal reason of the obligation: the will of God being the ground of the creation of Men and Angels.

Therefore as it is the ground of their being it must be the Rule of their acting.

The great difference then, is concerning the way and manner of the manifestation of Gods will to us. Whether it be his will revealed in the Scriptures, or only by the meer, light within which every man in common is endowed with? This is the question between us, which of these is the Rule.

Qu. We say there is no other Rule nor guide to eternal life, but the teachings of the light in every man.

Chr. I deny not a light to be in every man; for the understanding and conscience being parts of the reasonable soul, these do remain still in the worst of men: Though the Rectitude be, yet the Being of these faculties is not lost.

Though this is, and must be granted, yet I deny this light in every one to be a sufficient Rule.

(1.) Because this confounds the efficient and objective cause of our obedience. The light within especially assisted by the word and holy spirit, is the principle by which, but not the Rule according to which we obey. If the Light within be the Rule, then either the light must obey it self, which is absurd, or else there must be another light in man, besides that which is the Rule. But this is unintelligible. As then Inherent corruption is nothing else but our habitual disagreement with the Rule; so inherent grace is an habitual conformity to it. Hence the writing of the Law upon the heart is nothing else but suitable impressions upon the will agreeable to the Rule of duty. Then it will follow that the light and holiness which is in the soul is not the Rule, but only an inward conformity to it.

(2) There is a greater fulness and perfection in the Revelation of Gods will in the Scriptures, then is or can be, by this meer light within, which will appear in two things.

(1) Discovering such things, that the meer light in every man cannot make known unto us.

(2) In directing those actions dictated by this light

light within, to higher and more spiritual ends, then this meer light doth direct unto.

(1.) This light within cannot give a clear and distinct account, how sin came to be. If we consult the wisest of the Philosophers, we shall find a deep silence touching this point. In nothing were they more bewildred in their thoughts about, then this very thing: they saw that sin and misery did overflow, but they could not, by all the improvements of the light in them find out, how sin came to be.

And if this light within cannot acquaint us of the time when, nor the manner how, man was at first made; much less can we by this light be informed, whence Mankind came to be corrupted; what that Law was, by whom, and when it was first transgressed. But a full account we have of this whole matter in the holy Scriptures. Therefore,

(2.) Nor can this light within, give any account of that Remedy, which God in his infinite wisdom and will hath provided, to be a relief to man in his undone and miserable condition: That which is the rule, must carry with it a sufficient discovery of both these.

But so dim is this light within, about this whole mystery concerning Jesus Christ; that there is nothing lyes more remote from the common thoughts and apprehensions of men then this very thing: That Christ should be born of a Virgin, should dye, and that willingly for the benefit of others, should rise the third day. And to believe the things concerning him, should be the way and means, by which saln man should be

brought into a state of eternal felicity:—Are not these things Paradoxes to the reason and thoughts of men naturally? That God should pitch upon this way, for Christ to be mediator and surety; and that he should make expiation for sin. I say; this would no more be thought of by any meer creature, then that the *Israelites* could have found out that way of healing the biting of the fiery Serpent; by the Brazen Serpent on the Pole to be look'd unto.

Let us observe persons under inward sorrow for sin; and whilst they are grieving for, and exceeding tender about other sins, yet at the same time opposing Christ, and believing in him; and think this to be no sin: What doth this signify, but that the Doctrine concerning Jesus Christ is wholly supernatural? Hence though they shew the work of the law written in their hearts, (there being something in conscience to do the work of the law) yet the work of the Gospel is not written in mens hearts naturally.

Qu. Thou grants this light within is sufficient to teach us to acknowledge there is a God, and can it not inform us concerning Jesus Christ; Doth not Christ say the Father is greater then I, will it discover the Greater and not the Lesser.

Chr. This was George White-Head's argument to prove the sufficiency of the light in every man to be a rule: though by it he bewrayes his own ignorance and darkness. For though men do and may acknowledg there is a God, from what they see of his works: and also that he is just, and good, and that he is to be worshipped: will it therefore follow that meerly by this light, man may know what

what the will of God is. Could either *Adam* or Angels understand any thing of this; That God would pardon a sinner by Christ; That his Son should take flesh upon him: I say could any thing of this be understood, by all that may be known of God either in his nature or works? Was not this design of grace wholly hid in the Sovereign Breast and will of God? so that it could not be known, till he himself is pleased to reveal it. I shall descend to a far lower instance; *G. Whitehead* knows me to be a living man; Therefore may he know that I must necessarily eat, drink, and sleep; yet can he not by all the light he hath, know what my will is; what I will do, or which way I will go. Then much less in this case, now under consideration, 'tis not possible for any Man, nor Angel to know the will of God, till it be revealed. Indeed if *G. Whitehead* would say and prove, that Gods sending his Son into the World, was a necessary Act in God, that he could not do otherwise; then he might say something to his purpose. But if this purpose of grace and love towards sinful man was wholly free. And did arise not from any necessity in Gods nature, but from his good pleasure and Will, then this free act of his Will, could not be known, till he himself reveal it.

Moreover, the *insufficiency* of this *light* to discover this mystery, will farther appear from the Quakers themselves; For if the *light in them*, sees no necessity of a Mediator, now he is revealed, it is certain, they could never have thought of a mediator, had he never been revealed, &c.

(3) There is an utter *Insufficiency* in this meer

Light within to direct us, the right way of worshipping the true God. This is manifest from the great loss that the wisest amongst the Heathen have been, and still are under, in, and about this very thing. The multiplying of their Deities, And also of their own fancies and imaginations in their Rites, and Ceremonies, prove this. Infomuch that though (in many things with respect to moral goodness) there was something commendable in them: yet for their worship, we are told it was a worship performed to Devils, and false feigned Deities.

And notwithstanding this *light in them*, they still remained under the sence of a necessity of some farther discoveries both concerning God, and his worship. Whereupon they did ordinarily ascribe more to some immediate *Revelation*, then to the meer Dictates of the *light in them*.

Yet all this is no Disparagement to the *light within*: to say that God doth make any thing more known of his will then is or can be known by this meer *light within*: For 'tis but to say that each degree of light is serviceable to its end.

Since then God hath superadded by Divine Revelation other Laws and Rules for our guidance and instruction in this matter; then it cannot be conceived that this *light within* is sufficient. The ground of all Instituted worship, is the Revelation of Gods will. Hence, though the Jews had a *light in them*, by which they might acknowledge God ought to be worshipped: Yet that *light* could not direct them as to the way and manner, how that worship should be performed, so as to please

please him. This did wholly depend upon Gods making known his will concerning this thing.

Hence it was the Positive Law that directed them to confess sin over the head of a Scape-Goat; and to testify their thankfulness by Peace Offerings; and to pray with their face towards Jerusalem, &c.

So in the New Testament, it is the positive Precepts of our Lord Jesus which direct us hereabouts; without which we could know no more how to perform right service unto God, than a meer Barbarian.

(4.) Neither is this *light within* sufficient to discover to us that great Doctrine of the Resurrection of the Dead. This seemed so incredible to some of old, that they deemed the Apostle mad for discoursing about it. And you your selves are great instances to confirm this truth, of the *lights insufficiency* about this point, as will fully appear, when we come to speak of this particular.

So that in short, as the *water* will not rise higher then the Spring or Fountain, whence it doth proceed; so neither will this common *light*, above its source, nature, use, and end. Wherefore affront no more the grace and wisdom of God in superadding more; for which we are to be accountable at the great day approaching.

Secondly, This *light within*, directs not our actions to those holy and Spiritual ends, which the Scripture doth. Alas, whereto doth the best of mens actions naturally tend, but to swell them with proud conceits of themselves! what is, or can be more evident then this? How

Comes it to pass that Jesus Christ, (as to the great ends of coming into the World) is so much neglected, and the stress of many mens hopes laid upon something in themselves? Hence the hope of the Hypocrite, is compared to a Spiders Web, being spun out of their own Bowels. Do we not see this, in your selves who are the greatest admirers of the *light within*. What contemptible thoughts you have of the Person, Offices, and Sufferings of Jesus Christ; that you account his blood which was shed, no more then you do the blood of a common Thief? and esteem justification by that Righteousness which Christ wholly fulfilled in his own person without us, to be a doctrine of Devils. Hence you jeer and deride such that expect to be saved by that Person.

What intolerable pride, and arrogance have you arrived to, and all this in following (as you pretend) the conduct of the *light within*? Improving it, to the subverting and annihilating the Covenant of Grace, which is the onely way God hath revealed (since the fall) for the salvation of sinners; surely, then this *light* which instead of directing what you do in a way of subserviency to the ends of this covenant, doth directly oppose it, is in that so far from being a *sufficient rule*, that it ought to be rejected.

If then this *light within*, carry not with it such a stamp of Sovereign Authority. And if its discoveries are not so extensive and full, as that which is made known in the holy Scriptures. And if it direct not our actions to those ends, which the Scripture doth, then not this *light within*, but the Revelations of Gods Will in the *written word*, must be

be the Rule. Hence the dayes of the Gospel are called the last dayes; because we have not only the clearest and fullest, but the last Revelation of Gods will, both concerning Religion, and the way of Salvation by Jesus Christ, that we are to expect in this World.

Qu. *By what Rule shall we be convinc'd that the Scripture is the Rule, and hath this preheminance above the Spirit? thus Whitehead in his Apology, pag. 48.*

Chr. When Men have espoused notions propitious to the principles of pride and self flattery that is in them, 'tis hard to convince them of their mistakes: hence 'tis, that meer conjectures appear to them as the most convincing demonstrations: Otherwise *G. Whitehead* would never please himself with such a groundless question as this is. *We oppose not the Scriptures to the holy Spirit, but to the light within.* Therefore *Whitehead* deals deceitfully (like himself) in this question, Sets up a man of Straw; a figment of his own imagination, and fights with that.

I do therefore return him this Question, By what Rule shall we be convinced that the *light within* is the Rule, And hath this preheminance above the Scriptures? let him give as good reasons why the *light within* should have this preheminance above the Scriptures, as we have given why the Scriptures should have the preheminance above the *light within*. And the Controversie between us would soon be if-sued.

Qu. *What Rule had the Patriarchs? Had they any Scriptures? Was not the light within sufficient to them? if so? why not now?*

Chr.

Chr. For me to put you upon proof, that they were wholly left to the meer teachings of the *light within*, would be a task too difficult for you to undertake. Forasmuch as they were instructed, by Dreams, Visions, and by Angels, about things to be done, beyond what the meer *light* in them could dictate. But though they had not such written Laws and Rules, as afterwards God was pleased to vouchsafe to his People; this can be no argument against that which now is farther revealed to us, for our instruction, both concerning our knowledge of God and his Worship. Did ever such an objection as this drop from the mouth of *Moses* or any of the godly at that time? Did they say, Lord, our Fore-fathers were not governed by written Precepts, and what need we? Are we to prescribe to him, who hath absolute Sovereignty over us, what that *Rule* is, by which we will be governed? Would such disputing Divine Authority and goodness, have beseeemed them? If not, then have you a liberty to do what they did not dare to pretend to. Is any thing more evident, then that those Laws God gave to *Israel*, were a more perfect discovery of his Will to them, then either themselves before had, or was vouchsafed to other Nations at that time? And, is it not with respect to those Written Oracles, that they were advanced in dignity and priviledge beyond any other People? *Rom. 3. 1, 2. For which cause Salvation is said to be of the Jewes.* Inasmuch as they had the meanes of Salvation more eminently and peculiarly then any other Nations besides had. And so severe was God in keeping up the Authority of that written LAW, that who-soever should seek to draw them off from it, (though

{ though it were under the pretence of Dreames, yet) they should be stoned to death. *Dent.*

13.

Qu. *Is then the Bible thy God? Is that Ink and Paper thy Idol? away with it. Was not the Spirit before these words? That spirit we witness.*

Chr. The Bible is neither our God nor our Idol, but the means of our knowing God, and how to pay our homage to him. For this cause we dare not throw it away, the words and matter therein being dictated by the Holy Spirit, we think our selves obliged to hearken, and be obedient thereunto: But it is not the *Paper* and *Ink* that your spite is so much against, as the *sence* and *meaning*. 'Tis this Test your souls dread; for so long as that is attended to, your Impostures can gain little or no credit.

Qu. *How many have the Scriptures, that yet are never the wiser nor the better.*

Chr. How many have the *Light within*, yea and admire it, and pretend to walk up to it, yet are as ignorant and as wicked as any? Thou knowest this is true by many Horrid Instances.

Qu. *That is because they do not take heed to it.*

Chr. So say I, the fault is not in the Scriptures but in themselves, that those who have them are no better. Did they seriously read, believe, and obey, what is therein written, they would be both wiser and better. This very objection is answered, *Rom. 3. 3.* For what if some believe not, shall their unbelief make the faith of God without effect.

Qu. *'Tis dangerous for ignorant People to read them:*

So

So Fox and Hubbertborne in *Truths Defence*, pag.
101.

Chr. Then you would have us believe, when you dissuade people from the Scriptures, it is in meer kindness to them, to prevent their danger. But of whom learned you to be so kind? Was it from the *Light within*? or some Franciscan Fryar?

But if there be such danger in ignorant Peoples reading the Scriptures? How then shall they be instructed in those things that concern their eternal welfare?

Qu. By attending to the *light within*.

Chr. But what if this *light within* cannot fully instruct them?

Qu. They need not doubt that.

Chr. But they may: multitudes have pretended to follow this *light within*, yet have been deceived and misguided: and we see that the *light* in one man teacheth one thing, and the *light* in another a direct contrary, even amongst your selves; so that there can be no certainty of truth or error, sin or duty, by this. For that which is sin to one Man, is and may be duty to another: And consequently sin is nothing.

Qu. For their help, they would do well to attend upon our Ministry.

Chr. Sure you are not in earnest. Have you so often called people from *outward* teachings; and do you now set up what you have so long opposed and cryed down? Doth not this proclaim aloud the insufficiency of the *light within*? And all your clamorous outcries against others, vain?

Qu.

Qu. *Nay our Ministry doth only direct to the Light.*

Chr. What needs this Direction, if the Light be every way sufficient? But admit they should attend your Ministry, How shall they know that what they say is true?

Qu. *They cannot deceive them, for they are led by an Infallible Spirit.*

Chr. But what assurance can they have of that? Many may pretend (as you usually do) to speak immediately from the Spirit, and yet lie; must they venture their eternal states merely upon the credit of your Ministry? (and amongst others such as Fox, Dewsberry, Atkinson, Whitehead, Crisp and Penn, &c. that are so exceedingly corrupt, some of them in Morals, others in the Principles of Religion:) I see then 'twill to be safest to keep close to the Doctrine taught in the holy Scriptures, that will not deceive; but you both may and do deceive.

From the whole I apprehend thus much: that you are very sensible of an inconsistency in your opinions, with that truth delivered in the Scriptures; and that you can never (as you would) obtrude upon others, the lying fancies of your own brains; till first you do prevail with them to reject the Scriptures. Hitherto it is, that all your quarrels against the written word tend.

Having heard your opinion concerning the Scriptures, pray acquaint me honestly and truly; what you believe concerning the person of Jesus Christ?

Qu. *We believe he is the Son of God, and that as concerning the flesh, was Crucified and put to death at Jerusalem, &c.*

Chr.

Chr. This profession I confess carries a fair shew, but may I take it (without equivocations and meanings) to be the true and sincere belief of your friends?

Qu. *Yea verily.*

Chr. Verily I much doubt it, forasmuch as you frequently taunt at those that profess their belief in, and expect to be saved by this Jesus; as believing in a person without them, saying Christ is within: and there is no other Christ but that within every man. If this be so, (as thou knowest 'tis true) how can I believe you really mean as you speak, when you do so palpably contradict yourselves?

Qu. *We speak and mean sincerely, but thou understand'st us not.*

Chr. I remember *Crisp* (one of your Ministry) asked me what Christ I owned? I told him, I did not believe any meer principle or spirit in men to be the Christ, because such a meer principle was not capable of suffering that which Christ suffered: *Crisp* said, *This was Blasphemy.* But, Is this Blasphemy, to say the *light within* cannot be crucified? I farther told him, That the Christ I believ'd, was no other then that person the Scriptures speak of. The Word made flesh, God manifested in the flesh, called Emanuel, God with us, not the meer Godhead of the Son, nor the meer manhood, but God and Man united in one person, that is the Christ.

To which *Crisp* replied, *Then I know the beginning and Date of thy Christ.* I asked him whether he considered what he said? He answered, *I say again, I know the beginning and Date of thy Christ;*
many

many other Quakers then present heard this, but contradicted him not; whence I conclude, 'twas the mind and sense of them all. If this be true (as many credible persons in *London* can testify;) then whether it be not an apparent contradiction to what thou didst before profess? And whether that profession of thine be not deeply guilty of equivocation and deceit; Speaking one thing, yet really intending another: also bringing in another Christ and Gospel, which is by *Paul* pronounced Accurst, *Gal. 1. 8, 9.* Doth not this speech of *Crisp* carry with it a plain denial both of the divine and humane nature of Christ? For if he know the beginning and date of this Christ, then he is not God; for as God, he was before all beginning. And if he know the Date of this person, (*viz.*) When he ceased to be; Then there can be no such person in being as Christ.

Qu. *Alas for thee, these are thy own Dark Imaginations.*

Chr. Call them what you please. Thus I am certain *Crisp* spoke. But if thou canst explain his words, and render them more intelligible, and consistent with what at first thou didst profess; I am very willing to hear thee.

Qu. *I say again, we do believe in that Christ which dyed at Jerusalem.*

Chr. *Richard Stubbs* a Quaker, asking *Elizabeth VVetherly*, how she expected to be saved; she answered, by that Jesus who was born of the Virgin, and dyed at Jerusalem; *Stubbs* told her that was the false Christ, and an Antichrist. But that you may not think this was a hasty word dropped from a novice Quaker: Hear what *George Fox*,
(your

your great Prophet) saith in his great Mystery ,
 ' p. 206. *If there be any other Christ but he that was
 ' crucified within, he is the false Christ. And he that
 ' hath not this Christ that was crucified within, is a Re-
 ' probate. And further saith, pag. 207. That Gods
 ' Christ is not distinct from the Saints, and he that
 ' eats the flesh of Christ hath it within him , p. 210.*
 This he speaks in opposition to them , who af-
 firm'd Christs absence from his People , as to his
 corporal presence; can any man be more plain in
 denying the person of Christ without him? Yea,
 Doth he not in effect say, That he is the false
 Christ? Let me propose this Question: Is this Christ
 within, God or a Creature? if God; I ask, How
 can God be crucified? Wilt thou dare to maintain
 this Blasphemy? If a creature, Are you not then
 ashamed to make such a noise and trouble in the
 World about this *light within*. Which after all
 that Homage and Worship you have given to it,
 appears to be no more then a meer Creature. Is
 it not true then , that you who worship this *light
 within*, are as gross Idolaters as they who worship
 the Sun?

Qu. *These are slanders and lies, we own that
 Christ which dyed at Jerusalem.*

Chr. You may satisfie your selves with such Im-
 pertinent and ridiculous answers; Though I can as-
 sure you, these are the words of your Friends, and
 never were (as I know) retracted by them, nor
 contradicted by any others of you: yet seeing you
 affirm that you do believe in that person that dyed at
Jerusalem, be ingenious, and acquaint me wherefore
 he came into the World; and for what end did he
 suffer?

Qu.

Qu. To be a living example to all Generations, saith Naylor in his *Love to the lost*, printed, 1656. pag. 56.

Chr. Is this all? Did the word take flesh, and was the flesh crucified for no other end and purpose, then merely to be an example? Then all the Generations of men Good and Bad, that dyed before the appearance of the word in flesh, could no ways be concerned in the ends thereof: For, what use or advantage could an example be to them that were dead before? Certainly this is not all thou hast to say to this point.

Qu. He came to work Redemption.

Chr. This is nearer the matter; I *Quere*, for whom or what, did he work this Redemption?

Qu. There is a seed to which the promise of Redemption is, which seed is that which only wants Redemption; thus Naylor in the aforesaid Book, pag. 47, 48.

Chr. Naylor saith, That Christ is the election and the elect seed, pag. 32. and Fox in his *Great Mystery*, pag. 224. tells us, the seed to which the promise is, Is that which hath been laden as a Cart with sheaves by the sinner, which seed is the Hope Christ.

If then Redemption be of this seed, and this seed be Christ, either there must be more Christs then one, or else Christ came to redeem himself. Again, that Christ without, you esteem to be but a creature whose beginning and Date you know; but the seed within you is God. Tell me seriously whether a creature can Redeem the Creator? Is this according to the pattern of wholesome words, that form of sound Doctrine; or is it not palpable canting? Dare you pretend to be guided by an Infallible Spirit, and yet be guilty of such gibberish

berish and folly? Was Christ within ever under the curse, or a sinner? For such that were sinners and under the curse, Christ dyed for. *Rom. 5. 8. Gal. 3. 10. 13.* Again, if *Christ without*, came to redeem *Christ within*, why is it you slight the Redeemer as a person without; or doth that seed or light in thee which he came to redeem, teach thee to be so unworthy and ingrateful to its Redeemer as to have all the glory and preheminance ascribed to it self?

Qu. Here thou shewest thy dark mind, and that thou art still in the Imagination, understanding neither the Redemption, nor the Seed.

Chr. Doth this answer become the seriousness of the matter under consideration? I intreat thee (if thou canst) explain this Riddle to me; how this *seed within* which you so often call a *measure of God*, yea God himself. This which you have so much magnified above all that is without. How this should be redeemed by Christ without? For I profess I understand not this paradox, as you pretend to do.

From the whole I am very well satisfied how you own that Jesus which dyed at *Jerusalem*, and do believe that if you live and dye with those unworthy and base thoughts you now have concerning him, that you will be in danger of eternal Ruine.

I shall proceed to another question, whereas you affirm *Perfection* attainable in this life, I would know what it is you mean by *Perfection*?

Qu. Dost thou deny *Perfection* attainable in this life; is any point more plainly asserted, then this, in that which thou call'st thy Rule, (*viz*) the Scriptures?

Chr.

a Christian and a Quaker. 49

Chr. If the Scriptures be not thy Rule why dost thou argue from them?

Qu. Not because I own it to be so, but thou dost, and I would convince thee by them.

Chr. But if the Scriptures be not the Rule, nor a full declaration of the mind and will of God to us. How shall I know whether what thou wilt urge from them be true or no?

Qu. Dost not thou call the Scriptures the word of God, and thy Rule: will it not then be sufficient, if by them, I prove perfection attainable in this life?

Chr. If no other medium can be thought of so fit and apposite for the determining of this point, do not you then make them to be your Rule herein.

Qu. I wonder thou shouldst insist so much upon this, since I have told thee I own it not as the Rule, only I would convince thee by it.

Chr. But if there be any other way, of greater Authority then this, by which this point may be proved; why will you not urge it?

Qu. There needs no other medium be made use of to thee.

Chr. Then I perceive you are forced as much as any others to borrow from the Scriptures, without which you can no more prove any thing either concerning Christ, or perfection, then a meek Indian. Therefore seeing thou wouldst be at a loss should not the Scriptures be admitted, (in this case of necessity) I am very willing they should determine this question. But first I would know what thou mean'st by perfection?

Qu. Now thou run'st to meanings, but we deny meanings.

Chr. Something there must be wherein you differ from Christians in this matter; 'Tis but reasonable I should know wherein that difference lies. For they say, *Perfection* in the language of the Scriptures, (which thou admittst should be the Rule by which this controversie should be determined) often signifies sincere and upright. Thus *Job*, *David*, and other holy persons were perfect; yet this is not satisfactory to you; what more do you intend?

Qu. *We hold a perfect freedom from all sin in this life.*

Chr. I wonder not then, that Christians should dissent from you herein; and if I may judge of this notion by your course and practise, it causeth much pride, presumption, hinders all holy fear, humility, self-jalousie, watchfulness, and industrious endeavours to persevere in a holy course to the end.

Qu. *Alas for thee! where wouldst thou be perfectly free from sin, if not in this life?*

Chr. In Heaven, though thy question Imports, as if there were no such state after death, wherein Believers shall be perfect. However, If thou wilt prove a perfect freedom from all sin (that is of all kinds, and degrees of sin) in this life, thou must prove it to me, either by Scriptures, or instances of any person (Christ excepted) that ever attain'd to such a perfection.

Qu. *Wilt thou plead for sin, and for mens living in sin?*

Chr. God forbid; I distinguish between sin being in men, and mens living in sin. If thou canst prove a perfect freedom from sins inherency, that there is not any degree of it remaining in the best of men in this life, let me hear it; but remember thou must prove it by Scriptures, or Instances.

Qu.

a Christian and a Quaker. 51

Qu. I will prove it by both, (1) by Scriptures, Phil. 3. 15. *As many as are perfect be thus minded*, Mat. 5. 48. *Be perfect as your Heavenly Father is perfect.* (2) by instances, many of our friends do witness it.

Chr. That Text, Phil. 3. 15. proves it not; for the Apostle speaks just before, that he was not perfect, ver. 12. that is, had not perfectly attained. *Let us then as many as are perfect be thus minded.* How minded? To press towards the Resurrection of the Dead, Had they been perfect in thy sense, this exhortation was altogether needless. Therefore by perfection no more can be understood in this Text, then sincere, or upright, accompanied with an earnest reaching after perfection, as Paul did.

For that Text, Mat. 5. 48. *Be perfect as your Heavenly Father is perfect.* I presume thou intend'st not that we should be perfectly powerful, wise, and good as God is; for then we should be God: What then is the meaning of the Text, but this; Be merciful as your heavenly Father is merciful: That is, love your enemies; do good to them that hate you: The context clears this, These Texts therefore are of no advantage to your position, yea that *perfection*, this Text persuades unto, sufficiently proves your *Imperfection*, considering how little you abound in love to your enemies, and to them that hate you. Inasmuch that your consciences must needs stand convinced (if not fear'd) of extream Imperfection and wickedness.

Secondly, As to thy instances; thou sayst many of thy friends witness it. Though this proof be no other then a proud opinion of your selves, arising from pride and self-flattery in you; yet I

I shall examine some of them. (1) There was one of thy friends that pretended to perfection; yet that same person I proved guilty of Blasphemy, in saying the Kingdom of Heaven was in his Dog. The same man (as if he had respect neither to God, his word, nor his own credit) interprets that Text, *Lam. 4. 20.* (which intends a person) to mean the Spirit of God in man, which he calls *the Anointed Lord*, as you may see in his Pamphlet, intituled *Damnable Heresie Discovered*. Are such instances as these, the characters of a Perfect Man?

John Bolton, another of thy friends, said he was perfect. Nevertheless, this *Bolton*, did lately before many witnesses, call the eternal God to witness that he knew not such a Man, when yet that person was his intimate acquaintance. He having (as appears) let slip some unadvised words, in the hearing of that Man and his Wife. To whom in a little time he went (though he so solemnly protested he knew no such man) and enquires whether ever he spake such words in their hearing? They justified he did; he then again calls the eternal God to witness, that he never said so. This kind of saying and denying is ordinary with this *Bolton*, which I am certain is far enough from being the property of a sinless man.

3. *George White-head* (whatever his boasts are) is no perfect man; for I have, and can prove him guilty of deceit and falshood in matter of fact. Insomuch that meeting him alone in the street, I asked him, (not in an assaulting manner as he reports) but soberly, whether he was not ashamed of that Paper he had given out, wherein he pretended to give an account of a discourse betwixt him

him and my self, a little before ; He giving no satisfactory answer. I told him he was a Knave ; that is a false deceitful man, which the old man, or something else in him could not well bear. The reasons why I so spake, were for denying his opinions, when charg'd with them ; (*viz.*) Denying the person of Jesus Christ, and the Resurrection of the Body : He call'd this *an impudent lye, and slander.* But that he and the Quakers are guilty in this matter, and do really deny as before charged ; I will undertake to demonstrate to any person, our discourse was only upon one of these, (*viz.*) the Resurrection of the Body, whether he be innocent herein, I shall referr you to the discourse following, touching this point : wherein you have the summ of what he said, and believes concerning it. If then it do appear that he and the Quakers do deny the Resurrection of the Body ; then *White-head* is not only guilty of deceit, but his evil is the more aggravated, from his calling this an Impudent lye and slander.

2. He that shall give a false relation of what another man asserts, and do it wilfully, (as appears he hath done, from his own confession in that very Paper, acknowledging explications to be given of those positions he mentions ; yet give not the least hint what those explications were) I say such a man is false and deceitful : but thus hath he done. Wherefore I am so far from believing he is perfect, that I confess my self to remain under the settled perswasion of his Imperfection and dishonesty. And whereas he is pleased to call this Rayling, let him read *George Fox* in his *Great Mystery*, pag. 62. And he will there be

informed, that to speak truth, is not to give bad words.

Further, this *White-head* pretending to give a relation of what hapned, at a meeting in *Devonshire-House*, the 18th. of the seventh moneth: doth it with so much partiality, as renders him guilty of very great Imperfection. Saith he, The Baptists seem'd more like Beasts then Men; and made a hideous noise, when answers should be given. Whereas *White-head* cannot be ignorant that he had more liberty to speak for himself, then his opponent was allowed. Neither had *White-head* those interruptions and Affronts by the Baptists, as his antagonist had from the Quakers; who manifested as much Rudeness, as the worst sort of men are wont to do to their opposers. But *George White-head* often speaking, as if he would answer the Question, did little more, (as his own narrative shews) then multiply repetitions of what he at first said; which was so burdensome to the company, that therefore they called upon him, (which he calls clamours and hideous noise.) To speak directly to the Question, (*viz.*) Whether this Body of flesh and bones shall rise again? To which *White-head* answered, *That this Body of flesh and bones shall not rise again.* Yet so it is, This answer of his is wholly left out of that Narrative. But why it should be omitted, I see no reason; except that either his conscience was not so good, as to teach him to give an honest and impartial account; or else that his memory was so bad that it occur'd not to his mind when he was writing that Narrative. If either of these, then 'tis evident *White-heads* faculties have not arrived to that

Re-

Rectitude as is meet they should. Hence I conceive it to be more proper for him to be angry with himself, for being deceitful, then with another for telling him he is so.

4. George Fox that wrote the *Great Mystery of the Great Whore*, whom the Quakers esteem as one most eminent amongst them. There is enough in that Book to prove him to be both a deceiver, and a Blasphemer; those few instances before given of some of his opinions, may put us beyond all doubt in this matter.

Moreover, this Fox hath publicly been detected in many instances, for misreading or perverting the Scriptures, and that deliberately in his Books. See a Book, called *The Spirit of the Quakers Tried*. Printed, 1672.

Many more Instances I could produce, and give such Characters of their imperfection; but these may suffice to shew the Invalidity of this proof from your friends, pretending to witness perfection.

Qu. *If all this were true concerning these persons, it follows not, but that they might attain to perfection in this life.*

Chr. To press towards perfection is Our duty. But whether it shall be the priviledge of any on this side Death, I question, but that any Quaker can arrive to Perfection (in the way they are in) I believe is utterly impossible, except it be to be more perfectly the children of Death then they were before. Is this the way to be perfectly free from sin, to deny the Person of Jesus Christ; without them, to slight his institutions, to abandon the Scripture as the Rule? We may as reasonably

sonably conclude, that the way for a man to have perfect health, is to eat Mercury as his common food, and to drink the juice of Toads and Spiders as his common Drink.

The next thing I shall propose, is, Whether you believe the Resurrection of the Body?

Qu. *We do believe it, and whatever is said otherwise of us are lyes and slanders?*

Chr. What then doth Turner (one of your friends) mean by these arguments? (1) *If the bodies of men rise again, then there is a prebeminence, in the bodies of Men above the bodies of Beasts, which is to give Solomon the lye. Eccles. 3. 19* (2) *If the bodies of men should rise again; this is to give Job the lye: who saith, the Eye that sees me, shall see me no more, Job. 7. 8.*

And thirdly, *That flesh and blood shall not inherit the Kingdom of God.* Is not the Import hereof a manifest denial of the Resurrection of the Body?

Q.1. *I say we own the Resurrection of the Body, and wilt thou in thy envy and darkness say we deny it?*

Chr. Forasmuch as I am certain many of your ministry have opposed and disputed against this Principle. How can I but think you have some secret reserved meaning, (like the Jesuitical equivocation) coucht under this Profession.

Q.1. *We deny meanings and deceit; we speak in plainness and simplicity, what we believe.*

Chr. What signifies your denying deceit in words, so long as you are so notoriously guilty of it, in practice. I desire thou wouldst honestly inform me what that body is, thou believest shall rise again?

Que. *Wouldst thou have me to be wise above what is written?*

Chr.

Chr. By no means, It would be thy mercy, wert thou wise according to what is written. But why art thou so modest now, not to pretend to be wise above what is written? since thou hast so often denied the written word to be the Rule; advancing the *light within* above it. Surely then this seeming modest pretence, is but a cover to hide something, thou wouldst not have me or others acquainted with.

Qu. Is it not written, thou fool that which thou sowest is not the body which shall be, but God giveth it a body as pleaseth him.

Chr. Thus *White-head* replied, and *George Fox* the younger speaks to the same purpose. To Fools [saith he] *that say this body of natural flesh and bones shall rise. I say the body which is sown, is not the body which shall be. I quere whether both these persons do not tacitly deny the Resurrection of the Body?*

Qu. In no wise, for we say every seed shall have its own Body?

Chr. But answer directly, shall this body rise again? if not, what seed that is, which shall have its own Body?

Qu. I must answer you in the Apostles words *where-with he answered such Fools as put the same question, 1 Cor. 15. 35, 36, 37, 38. Thou Fool, that which thou sowest is not the Body which shall be.*

Chr. This answer *White-head* said is sufficient for such busie intruding Fools. But he would do well to examine who tis the Apostle calls Fools; not they that believed, but they that deny'd the Resurrection of the Body. Twas persons of the same perswasion with the *Quakers* in this point. What say you is that which God giveth a body to as pleaseth him?

Qu.

Qu. 'Tis that which the Apostle saith, to every seed its own body.

Chr. What is that Seed?

Qu. Thus being unsatisfied with the Apostles answer you obtrude Questions.

Chr. The Apostle saith, *It shall be raised*, that *IT* can have reference to nothing else but the Body which dyed. *It* is sown in corruption; *It* is raised in incorruption, 1 Cor. 15. 42, 43, 44 *And this Mortal shall put on Immortality. This corruptible shall put on incorruption.* vers. 53, 54.

Qu. Doth not the Apostle say expressly, vers. 37. *The body that thou sowest is not the body which shall be, &c.*

Chr. Yes, and he doth as expressly tell us, *This Mortal shall put on Immortality.* The Apostle then in pursuance of his own Metaphors, (though Metaphors as we say run not of all four, yet it agrees in this) that the Body given *It*, is the same for substance; the same that was sown, *It* is not quickned, except *It* dye, ver 36. To this purpose he speaks elsewhere. Rom. 8. 11. *shall quicken your mortal Bodies;* can any other be meant by mortal, then the same for substance, only called a Body given to *It*; because it is so changed from *Its* accidents of corruption and mortality. According to that, *He shall change our vile Bodies,* Phil. 3. 21. This cannot be meant of a new created Body; because such a Body cannot be said to be either *Vile*, or *Changed*. If then this, *It* be not the body which dyed, but another. How can that be called a Resurrection, for that supposeth the same? If another, then 'tis more properly a creation of a new body, then the Resurrection of the Body. Be plain with me and let me know what this *IT* is? And what

what *this mortal* is, that must put on Immortality? 'Tis express, the Apostle treats of the Resurrection of the Dead. Consequently the *Body* which is raised, must be the *Body* that was *Dead*. If not this body, Is it the Soul? This you cannot intend; for you say the soul is part of Gods being; and consequently that Dyes not. If not this, is it the *seed*, that which you call the light and spirit of God in the soul. This neither can be asserted, for that also you say is God. If none of these, neither the body nor the soul be this *IT* which shall be raised; I *quere*, how the Saints can be concerned in the comfort of the Doctrine of the Resurrection of the Dead? therefore I intreat thee to answer directly; shall this body rise again or not?

Qu. *This body of flesh and bones shall not rise again,* said George Whitehead, before many witnesses.

Chr. Is not this a denial of the Resurrection of the body?

Qu. Nay, for though I believe not the Resurrection of *this body*, yet I do of a body; for every seed shall have its own body, &c.

Chr. George Fox the younger, in the collection of his books, pag. 210. saith, *There is a seed of the Serpent, and the seed of Christ; and they that discern the body of each seed, are not the fools which are questioning how the dead shall be raised, and with what bodies they shall come forth? for they know that all man-kind will be found in one of these two seeds.* But Fox doth not inform us what this seed of Christ, and the seed of the Serpent is; each of which (he saith) shall have their own body. And since he calls them fools, (that is the Apostles and all true Christians) that say this body of flesh and bones shall rise

rise again; 'tis manifest *Fox* intends another body: But what body (according to his Tenents) is utterly unintelligible.

For if this *seed* of the Serpent be only sin, and the *seed* of Christ only grace or, the *light within*; then *Fox* must be understood thus. That 'tis only sin and grace which shall rise again; But if sin be but an accident, how can we conceive that this should rise without its subject; And if grace only shall rise, then it must be said of it, *That it was sown a natural, corruptible, and mortal body*. And if the body rise not, then grace also shall be raised without its subject. Is it credible, That this should be all the Apostle intends by the Resurrection of the Dead? Are such dictates as these according to that form of sound doctrine which Christians should hold fast unto? or is it imaginable that persons thus speaking are guided by an Infallible Spirit, as they most wickedly pretend?

Qu. *Thou in thy envious and malicious mind mayst report, that we deny the resurrection of the dead body, but we will say it is an impudent lye; for we believe the Resurrection of the body, though we know not what that body is which shall rise.*

Chr. Thou saidst before, the *light within* was the Divine Essence, and now thou sayest thou knowest not what this body is: either then thy *light within* thee is not God, or God knows not all things: But if God do know all things, and consequently what this body is which shall rise; Then what thou affirm'st of this *light within* is a lye.

But is there not hypocrisie and deceit in this pretence; Thou sayest there is a body that shall rise, and dost thou not know what body thou meanest,

a Christian and a Quaker. 61

meanest, though thou thus speak ? If it be truth which thou believest, why art thou not willing to speak it out ? And since thou art not free to do that, Give me leave to relate what I know many of your friends do indeed believe, and have asserted concerning this matter. *We own* (say they) *the Resurrection* ; That is, *we witness it*. But what is it you witness ? *The Resurrection of the seed* ; what then is this seed ? 'Tis the light, 'tis *Christ in you*. But is this all the Scriptures intend by the Resurrection of the dead ? was *Christ* and the *light within* sown a natural, a mortal, and a corruptible *Body* ? Is this your witnessing to the Scriptures ? not only to deny the Doctrine therein delivered, but in the stead thereof, assert and maintain blasphemy ? I stand astonished, that if thou hast such a light in thee, as thou pretendest ; it doth not condemn and reprove such wicked and perilous conceits.

Qu. Alas for thee thou vain ignorant man, thou knowest not these things, but speakest evil of what thou understandest not.

Chr. These are your common, (though ridiculous and childish) reflections, but how they will secure you from the just censure of judicious and godly persons, I see not : was ever any persons (the Jesuites themselves) more apparently guilty of equivocation and deceit then you are ? The Scriptures speak of the Resurrection as a thing to come ; but you intend it of something past, and witness in your selves, what is falsehood and deceit, if this be not ? The Scriptures speak of the Resurrection of *Christ* in his own person, as of the first fruits, as the pledge and pattern of the Resurrection of his people. That Resurrection of
Christ

Christ in his own person is past, and he shall never dye more. *Revel. 1. He was dead, and is alive, and lives for ever.* And you speak of no other Resurrection, but of Christs dying and rising in you. Is this the language of the holy spirit speaking in the Scriptures, or is it agreeable to it? Is it not easie to guess by what spirit you are guided? And is not the import of thy opinion hereabout, a palpable denial of all future and distinct Beings and Existencies after Death? And can it have any other tendency, then to all kind of impiety and irreligion? *For if the dead rise not, then Christ is not risen*; and all preaching and believing is no other but an imposture and fancy, and the Apostles are found false witnesses: And if the soul return into God being a part of God, (as that great impostor *George Fox* affirms) what need any man at all to be concerned about Religion? For whether we do good or evil, 'tis all one as to the event; for the body perisheth for ever, and the soul cannot miscarry, being God. 'Tis no wonder then you reprobate the Scriptures, and the person of Jesus Christ without you: Forasmuch as cleaving to them, signifies no more as to the issue, then the rejecting of them. Thus do you undermine the very foundations of Faith, Hope, and Holiness of life, like *Hymeneus* and *Philetus*, *2 Tim. 2. 17.* who said the Resurrection is past already.

And do also herein proclaim to the World that your Religion is a meer cheat, calculated only to the service of the Devil, and your own lusts: since, for any eternal advantage that is to be reaped by it, that your Tenents manifestly Deny.

From the premises, you and others may understand the reason why I oppose the Christian to the Quaker.

Though

Though I very well know, The *Quakers* cannot endure to be Catechized, yet (for the sake of others) I shall sum up what hath been before said, In this following Catechism: That by the answers to each Question, (which are no other than what the *Quakers* give, both in words and practise) any person (though but of ordinary capacity) may apprehend the Pride, Errour, and Wickedness, that is both in these people, and their opinions.

Q. How may we be saved?

A. By obedience to the light within.

Q. What is this light within?

A. 'Tis God, saith *G. Whitehead*.

Q. How is this proved?

A. From *Joh. i. 4.* If the Life be the Divine Essence, The Light within must be so also. For such as the cause is, such the effect must be. *G. Whitehead*.

Q. Will. Pen directly contradicts this in his Apology, pag. 108. affirming the effect can never be so worthy as the cause: which of them must be believed?

A. Will. Pen speaks only with reference to the Scriptures, in which sense we agree with him, But he saith not so, respecting the light within.

*Q. His words are general, Importing every effect; if so, whether then he doth not invalidate and overthrow *G. W's.* Argument?*

E

A. Thou

A. Thou must not so understand *W. Pen.*

Q. *why not?*

A. Because he owns the light within to be God.

Q. *If the light within be God, How say you 'tis an effect? pray inform me from what cause, God is an effect.*

A. Thou shewest a cavilling mind.

Q. *Is not this a baffling and ridiculous answer?*

A. 'Tis like thy carnal reason may think so.

Q. *Will. Pen and G. W. both pretend to an infallible Spirit. Are such contradictions as these a Demonstration thereof?*

A. Alas for thee, thou canst not understand them.

Q. *If you own Pen's saying as true, because you think it serves to disparage the Scriptures; And if G. W. assertion (which is apparently contradictory) shall also pass for a demonstration with you; being urg'd in favour of that you would have others to believe. Then, whether your reasons are not rather determin'd by your opinions, than they proved true by your reasons? And whether such that can thus blow hot and cold, affirm and deny at pleasure, are to be beeded in their pretences to Infallibility?*

A. Thou manifests a perverse spirit.

Q. *Do not such answers manifest the pride of your hearts, that though you agree not amongst your selves, yet you hate to be told of it, and most of all to confess it?*

A. 'Tis but thy own Imagination to think that we differ.

Q. *But is there no other God but the light within?*

A. We own no other.

Q. *Did this light within create the Heavens and the earth,*

earth, &c. it being proved that it self is but a creature?

A. Yea.

Q. Do not those expostulatory Interrogations which God puts to Job (in the 38, 39, and 40 chapters) prove the contrary?

A. Here thou shewest thy vain and busie mind.

Q. But is this light within the immediate object of Divine worship?

A. Yea.

Q. Is it not Idolatry to worship the light within?

A. To call this Idolatry (saith R. West,) is damnable Heresie.

Q. Doth not this justifie that Horrid Act of James Naylor, in receiving and accepting Hosanna with Divine worship and honour, at Bristoll, and all who did Attribute the same to him? and also tend to lead others to the like Arrogancy, Blasphemy, and Idolatry?

A. I think not meet to answer such enquiries.

Q. In what part of man is this light set up?

A. In the soul.

Q. What is the soul?

A. 'Tis a part of God, and of Gods being, says G. Fox.

Q. Is not this as much as to say, the Soul is God?

A. Yea.

Q. Do you indeed believe the Soul is God?

A. That which is without Beginning, and Infinite, which is of God, and returns into God, must needs be God: but such is the Soul. See Foxes Great Mystery.

Q. If the Light be God, and the Soul be God, how say you God sets up a light in the soul? Doth he set up a light in himself?

A. We are Dead to distinctions.

Q. Is there but one light in every man?

A. There is but one Light; All the rest is Darkness. The Light shined in Darkness.

Q. But if the Light be set up in the Soul, And yet the Soul is a part of God, what mean you by the light shining in darkness? Is any part of God Darkness?

A. Now thou runst into the Imagination.

Q. Doth the darkness obey this light, or doth the light obey itself?

A. It obeys it self.

Q. Is it proper to say God obeys himself?

A. Thou wouldst have thy carnal wisdom satisfied.

Q. But is God Superiour, and Inferiour to himself?

A. This is a vain Question, and Questioners are out of the truth.

Q. Do you believe the Scriptures to be the true sayings of God?

A. Yea, so far as they agree to the Light in me.

Q. Hast thou an infallible Spirit to determine what is and what is not truth?

A. Yea.

Q. How shall I know that?

A. I witness it.

Q. Must I believe thee upon thy own words?

A. I would have thee so to do.

Q. Wert thou never mistaken about persons nor things?

A. This is an ensnaring question.

A. Did the Primitive Christians use to answer thus?

A. We

A. We deny Imitation, we are to speak as we are moved.

Q. Are the Dictates of the Light within of as great authority as the Scriptures?

A. Yea, and Greater, saith G. Whitehead.

Q. Do you not then deny the Scriptures to be the Rule?

A. Yea, there is nothing in the Scriptures that is a duty upon me, or which I am obliged to obey, because 'tis there recorded, saith Benj. Furley in a Letter of his.

Q. Why say you so?

A. Because whatever is a command to me, I must not receive from any man, or any thing without me, nay not from the Scripture it self; yea 'tis the Greatest Errour in the world that ever was invented, and the Ground of all Errour to affirm, that the Scriptures ought to be a Rule to Christians. Thus Furley.

Q. Then, whether Abraham's commanding his children, and household, (yet highly approved of God) was not rather an argument of pride and presumption in him, then of sincerity? Forasmuch (according to your opinion) they were not obliged to receive any thing as a command from him? Gen. 18. 19.

And whether the Jewes might not (under this pretence) have rejected the whole Law, being given forth to them by the hand of Moses? Joh. 1. 17. Luk. 5. 14. 2 Ch. 24. 6.

And whether the men of Judah, for the like reason, might not have looked upon themselves as unconcerned in that command of Asa, 2 Chr. 14. 4.

And to what purpose are we enjoyned to obey them

them that have rule over us, Heb. 13. 17. if we must receive nothing as a command from any man or thing without?

And whether the Apostles did not take too much upon them, in laying commands upon Christians, and expecting their obedience thereunto, 1 Theff. 4. 11. 2 Theff. 3. 4. 1 Tim. 4. 11. 1 Cor. 14. 15.

A. 'Tis like, under those former Dispensations, persons might be under some obligation to obey such commands; But what is this to us that are under the purest Administration?

Q. But wherein is your Administration purer than that which the Primitive Christians were under?

A. We witness it.

Q. Since you own not the Scriptures as a Rule, of what use are they?

A. They are a declaration of the Saints conditions.

Q. Are they of no farther use?

A. Not to us, for we are come to the end of the Scriptures, saith Fox.

Q. Doth that spirit in you testify to the same Jesus the Scripture doth?

A. Yea, verily.

Q. Is there any other Christ besides the light within?

A. Nay.

Q. Is this light within that very Christ the Prophets and Apostles did bear witness unto?

A. Yea.

Q. How do you prove that?

A. Did not John bear witness to the light?

Q. Is this the light in every man?

A. Yea.

Q. Is this light within, That Christ which was born of the Virgin, and dyed at Jerusalem?

A. Thou art drunk with words.

Q. Do you acknowledge that Christ did dye at Jerusalem?

A. Yea, the flesh of him dyed, but Christ which was in that flesh is in every man.

Q. Is there more Christs than one?

A. Christ is but one.

Q. For what end did Christ dye?

A. To be a living example, saith Naylor.

Q. Was that all?

A. Nay, he did work Redemption for the seed.

Q. What is this seed?

A. Christ is the elect seed, saith Naylor. The seed is the hope Christ, saith Fox.

Q. Did Christ without redeem Christ within? O horrible madness and folly!

A. We say tis the seed to which the promise of Redemption is, and which onely wants Redemption, saith Naylor.

Q. But was not Christ without a meer creature?

A. Yea, for I know the Beginning and Date of that Christ, saith Crisp, a Leading Quaker.

Q. Is not this seed within God?

A. Yea, for the promise is (saith Fox) to the seed which hath been laden as a cart with sheaves, by the sinner.

Q. You said before, Christ is but one, and now you speak as if there were two, the one God, and the other a creature; how shall I understand thee?

A. Indeed thou canst not understand.

Q. But how can a creature redeem the Creator?

A. I see thou art still in the Imagination.

Q. Is this answer pertinent?

A. 'Tis fit for thee.

Q. Is it not incredible that a creature should Redeem God?

A. Indeed thou canst not believe, thy mind being in the darkness and enmity,

Q. But canst thou give a rational account hereof?

A. Why demandest thou a rational account? I deny thy reason, we witness this Redemption.

Q. Canst thou tell what it is thou dost witness?

A. Yea.

Q. Why dost thou not?

A. 'Tis words thou lookst for.

Q. Did the Apostles use to answer thus.

A. The Spirit is free, 'Tis like when they were moved they might speak.

Q. Art not thou moved to give account what it is thou dost witness?

A. Not to thee who art in the envious and dark mind.

Q. Is there not deceit in this pretence?

A. We deny deceit, we are in the pure.

Q. Dost thou not give ground to suspect deceit?

A. Nay, there is that in thee, doth witness to me if thou wouldst heed it.

Q. I confess there is that in me that believes thou art full of pride, heresie and hypocrisie, is it this thou meanest which bears witness to thee?

A. I see thou art a wicked Creature and hast nothing of God in thee.

Q. If I have nothing, how then have all men a light of G. d in them.

A. Thou

A Catechism.

71

A. Thou hadst such a light, but it is lost.

Q. Be plain with me. Doth the Scriptures when they speak of Jesus Christ, intend only the Light in every man, or a person without?

A. Now thou runst to meanings, but we deny meanings.

Q. I know you own meanings; why then are you so rash in speaking thus?

A. Thou art an Impudent Lyar, we do deny meanings.

Q. The Apostle saith let your women keep silent in the Churches: Why suffer you women to declare.

A. The woman to be silenced is the flesh.

Q. Dost not thou give a meaning now, and a very ridiculous one? When you deny meanings must not we understand it of true ones, since perverse and false meanings no people more abound with than you?

A. Thou art a Serpent.

Q. Hath the flesh a husband?

A. Yea.

Q. Who is it?

A. The Devil.

Q. The Text saith let her ask her husband at home: must the flesh be instructed by the Devil in the things of Religion?

A. Alas for thee, I comprehend thee, and see thy subtilty.

Q. Do you believe the Resurrection of the dead?

A. We Witness it.

Q. Is there no other Resurrection than what you witness?

A. Not

A. Not as we believe, or can give account of.

Q. Are you then as perfectly happy as ever you expect to be?

A. We witness perfection.

Q. What proof is this to another man?

A. We say, we witness it: Is not this proof sufficient?

Q. But what if I believe otherwise?

A. We shall not spare to stigmatize and condemn that person that questions the truth of our sayings.

Q. Will this convince me, or any other, of your perfection?

A. Though it do not, yet thereby we shall render you so odious to our Friends, that they will believe nothing that is spoken by you against us.

Q. Then may I not conclude, that the Reason why you so freely Rail against, and Reproach your opposers, is onely to secure your credit with your own Profelites?

A. I cannot deny, but that there may be something of that in it.

Q. Will you be so liberal of your revilings, whether your adversaries give occasion or no?

A. It concerns us to render them as ridiculous as we can, and to make our Friends believe they do nothing but contradict themselves: and if this fail, we will insinuate qy way of Question something that may be reproachful to them (which unwary Readers will be very apt to take for granted.) But if what we do suggest should be groundless, we will excuse our selves, by saying we did but *Queire* whether it was so or no; thus *Whitehead* deals with *Mr. Danson* and others,

Q. But

Q. But doth not this signifie a very dishonest and malicious mind in you?

A. We care not what you think, provided our Friends think not so.

Q. One of your Friends meeting with a person that had writ against you, tells him, that if he did write any more against them, that they would print any thing against him, that any person would report, be it what it would: Is such a practise; a proof your perfection?

A. Now thou slanderest us.

Q. I slander you not, but can (if need be) name thy Friend that said so, and also the person to whom and produce others, that can and will attest the truth hereof. Doth not such expressions bewray a very wicked and bad Spirit within?

A. I cannot believe any of our Friends said so.

Q. Doth not Will. Pen in his Book against the Author of The Spirit of the Quakers tried, manifest great displeasure against the man for concealing his name; suggesting, that if he knew it, then probably they might have something to detect him? And because he will not be wanting to throw all the dirt he can, ventures to stigmatize him for a Socinian? Doth not this demonstrate that your skill lies more in imperious, abusive, and scurrilous language (as all your books against any that oppose you will witness) than in a rational evincing the truth of what your selves hold, — or answering the Arguments of your opposers?

A. Whatsoever thou or others may think of our Writings, we will give it out, that we have both answered and confuted our Adversaries; and our Friends will believe what we say in this matter, which is enough to us.

Q. In

Q. In as much as you believe this body shall never rise again : And that the Soul being part of God, shall return into God ; Is there any necessity we should concern our selves about Religion ?

A. I am not free to answer thee.

Q. But if the Body shall not rise, and the Soul return into God ; will it not necessarily follow, that Religion is a meer Imposture ?

A. We think not so : Though we believe this Body shall never rise more.

Q. Doth not the Apostle draw this very consequence : That if the Dead rise not, then preaching and believing are in vain, and what doth it advantage us, 1 Cor. 15.

A. Thou seest we do mind Religion, and do suffer for the sake thereof, therefore thou maist think we have something that is an encouragement to us.

Q. But if this can be nothing respecting a future life, for if thou dost well, thy Body can be never the better for it, because it shall never rise more ; And if thou dost ill, thy Soul cannot miscarry, (being as thou sayst a part of God,) what then can thy encouragement be ?

A. We have sufficient encouragement, though thou understand it not.

Q. Since it is not the good of the promises which shall be fulfilled to persons after Death, it must be some other thing, pray what is it ?

A. We say there is a seed shall be saved.

Q. But if this seed be only God, and Christ, what is this to you ?

A. Is

A. Is not this sufficient?

Q. Why will you not be free, and plainly tell me what it is, that doth influence and prevail with you to do, and suffer as you do?

A. What dost thou think it should be?

Q. May not the satisfaction of your wills and lusts, the promoting your carnal interest, be your chief motive and inducement?

A. We deny the flesh and the lusts, this is thy own dark imagination.

Q. May not you live in, and fulfil the lusts of the flesh, whilst you deny it in words? I am serious with you, since your opinion denies any eternal advantage to be reaped by persons after Death, in denying the Resurrection of this Body; must you not then have respect only to something to be enjoyed here, as your encouragement?

A. We are above the World, and all its encouragement.

Q. This is no other (to me) than a vain boast; because I am assured, no sort of people whatever do more eagerly grasp after the world, than you do: Inasmuch that I believe your carnal advantages is one great thing in your Eye, in your sedulous endeavours to augment your numbers; if I mistake you, inform me what it is that doth animate you.

A. Thou seest we suffer in our worldly concerns for our principles, how then can this be our encouragement?

Q. Though you may sustain some outward losses, yet whether you have not a way to augment your outward gains, by losing?

A. Thou manifests a perverse and evil mind.

Q. If

Q. If not that, then may not a disposition to be singular, and to walk Antipodes to all other men, and to be noted in the world, as a people of peculiar motions and fancies prevail very much with you, to do and suffer as you do?

A. We deny dispositions, Thou suggestst thy own Imaginations.

Q. Then may not your enmity against the person, ministry, and institutions of Jesus Christ; and against the Scriptures as the Rule, that may you but prevail with men to Reprobate these, you care not, (for revenge is sweet,) what difficulties you sustain: I aske you, doth not this influence you very much?

A. Indeed we do deny the outward Person of him thou callest Christ, and also the Scripture as the Rule: we do affirm, that they who expect to be saved by that Christ without, will be damned in that Faith; therefore we do perswade all men we converse with, to acknowledge no other Christ, but the light within, and do confess that the succeeding of our endeavours herein, is a very great encouragement to us, though not all.

Q. If not all, and yet you will not freely speak out what more it should be, whether then you are not really acted and influenced, either by some Romish Emissaris to insinuate covertly many of their own Heresies, to distract, deform, and defame the Protestant profession; or else hurried by him, who is the great Enemy of God and men, into such traps and precipices, wherein he seeks to entangle you to your eternal Ruine?

A. Alas for thee, I see thou art in the dark, and know'st not what thou say'st.

Q. But

Q. But if (according to thy principles,) all thou dost in, and about that which thou callest Religion, can be no other than an imposture, a woful deceiving both of thy self and others; would it not be thy mercy to see this in time, that thou mayst escape the Danger, which inevitably will ensue if thou persist and go on?

A. Trouble not thy self for us, we fear nothing.

Q. May not you flatter your selves, and a lye be in your right hand, feeding upon ashes, and a deceived heart turn you aside for all this? And will not the conclusion of walking in the light of your own sparks be to lye down in sorrow?

Wherefore let me intreat thee to take heed how thou givest credit to the imaginations of thy own heart; and to Repent of the Error of thy way, and to be earnest with God to shew unto thee the path of life?

Be willing to be instructed, oppose not thy self to that truth he hath revealed in the Holy Scriptures. But fall down under the authority thereof: For who can tell, but yet thou mayst find mercy?

And whatever at present thou mayst think or say of me, I do assure thee I have not the least prejudice against any Person among you; my design being only to help you out of the snare wherein you are intangled, by laying before you what your Tenents are, together with their natural Issues and consequences.

In which I have done my duty. If then you will go on, and resolve to dye by your own hands, notwithstanding all the means that is used to prevent it, I must say, your blood be upon your own heads.

POST-

POST-SCRIPT TO THE READER.

THis Essay towards the Discovery and detecting the Opinions, Hypocrisie, and Deceit of the *Quakers*, I hope may be serviceable, not only to Antidote many against the malignant influence of their errors, But also for the recovery of some already taken in their snare.

However, be the event and issue what it will, In this I shall have peace, being conscious to my self, that I have not in any thing misrepresented them; The most part of what is said being either what my self hath heard from their own mouths [having often been concerned in debates with them,] or what is published to the world by their approved Leaders.

One *Quaker* indeed is taken notice of, that should not have been concerned in this Dialogue, had I not been thereunto necessitated, from a late pamphlet published by him, intituled, *Damnabie Heresie Discovered*; one of those positions he is pleased to repute so, you have account of before; Another is this; *'Tis Damnable Heresie* (saith he) *to say Christ was not actually exhibited in the times of Moses, &c.*

'Tis not deny'd but that Jesus Christ, as mediator, was in purpose and promise long before: Neither do I in the least question the eternal Deity of that Word which in time took Flesh; But, Though this is, and (by me) must be granted, yet I believe not, that the Word was then made Flesh, that Christ was actually made known as God, in
Flesh,

Flesh, according to the mystery and intendment of those types, — Naylor, (one of their own prophets) in his *Love to the lost*, printed 1656. pag. 55. tells us, "the law was added because of transgressions, till the seed should come, of whom it was prophesied in types and figures, which seed is Christ. Whatever Naylor in other passages may suggest, seemingly repugnant hereunto (for I know 'tis almost impossible for a Quaker to speak or write concerning Christ without self contradiction) yet herein he hath said enough to give himself or others the lye, who shall affirm that the Light in Moses, or in the Jews, was that very Christ signified by those Types; consequently then, 'Tis no Damnable Heresie, to say that the Messiah, as therein signifi'd, was neither the light in them, nor was then actually exhibited.

But this man (as I said before) had not this occasion been given, should have been passed by, as unworthy of notice; because I know some Quakers will be ready to say, they own him not: though why they should not, I see no reason, except it be (as we say, children and fools speak truth) his being too apt to blab out what others of them would have conceal'd though it be their own opinions.

If then, by the account given in the Dialogue concerning these people, the folly and blasphemy of their Tenents, be and is fully made manifest; will it not concern us (as we respect our eternal welfare) to take heed how we credit such Impostors?

If we reflect back to their first rise, (which Will. Pen confesseth was not long since, perhaps twenty years) we shall find the first foundation they laid of this their irreligion, was in the Denying the Holy

Scriptures as a Rule. And the person, ministry, and Institutions of Jesus Christ as things without them.

And the way through which they commenc'd and arrived to that degree of perfection they pretend to, was by quakings, foamings at the mouth, with dreadful roarings and howlings, which was then more common with them, when first they were known to the world. In all which, 'tis notorious, they have been eminently influenc'd, and acted by him, that bears the greatest ill will to the Souls of men.

And in their endeavours to propagate and instill these their delusions, they are deeply guilty of most wretched deceit and falshood, than which, nothing is more evident to those who have been concerned in contests with them; insomuch that their greatest strength (if I may so call it) lyes chiefly in their Hypocrisie and Equivocations. If any (whose affections are not pre-ingaged) will but seriously read their own Books, wherein they either pretend to state their own principles, or answer such as have disputed against them, they will find their replies are for the most part impertinent and frivolous, or else stigmatizing and branding their opposers. But very rarely laying down (as honest men would do) in plain and intelligible words their own positions and proving them. I say, whoever shall read *George Foxes Great Mystery*, and *Naylors Love to the lost*; may find such plenty of canting non-sence, yea, and Blasphemy, as will sufficiently give them satisfaction herein, that were they not commended to simple-minded people under the name and mask of Christian Religion, (whereas the Mahometan may as well be called so) there would be no more danger of the efficacy of their Books than of the Translation of the Turkish

Turkish Alcoran into English, which I presume never yet made one Profelyte. Wherefore this wicked (though common pretence of theirs in speaking by the immediate movings of the Spirit of God, ought to be matter of trembling and astonishment to us, that ever such horrid forgeries should be intitled upon the holy Spirit; which never did lead any from Jesus Christ, God-man, as a person without us; nor teach any to reject his institutions: And yet in the slighting of these, consists the High Attainments of this people: though herein they excel in nothing, what a meer slave of the Devil may and ordinarily doth arrive unto,

Was not Satan the first that ever rais'd dispute against an Institution? *Gen. 3. 1.* whose Profelytes must they then be that maintain and keep up the controversies?

And was God so severe in punishing the World for the breach of an institution, and shall we esteem them such outward and trivial things, as not worthy our observance? was Jesus Christ the Mediator so great a gift? was the design of Love and Grace therein so wonderfull, that the Angels beheld with wonder? Is there so many mysteries? such heights and depths in that great work of Redemption by him? And now must all this be reprobated as a thing without us? And that blood which he shed, no more accounted of than the blood of another man? And this from the meer Fancy and Imagination of something more perfect within, (which *Pen* calls the *universal Grace that every man is endued with*)

Whereas man had this *Light within*, before all

this was done and suffered by Jesus Christ, to affirm then this meer *Light within* was, and is sufficient to bring about this great end, (*viz.* remission of sins, and eternal Salvation as *Pen* saith,) Is it not in effect to say the death of Christ was vain and to no purpose? And consequently that it was cruelty in the Father to *prepare him a Body* in which he was to suffer such a needless death.

'Tis true the Heathen Philosophers did esteem this Doctrine of Christ crucified, (not *within* as Quakers ridiculously talk, but without) to be foolishness, they did Arraign this and other great Principles of the Christian Faith, before this *Judge*, I mean the *Reason* and *Light* in them, and passed judgment upon them as meer Illusions and Fancies. Do not the Quakers tread in their steps, as if they had been documented and only instructed by them? Yea do they not reject the very head of the Christian Religion, and lift up themselves into an equal sufficiency with the Person of Christ, and raise the very foundations of all true Faith, Hope, and holiness of life? Do not such expressions as these (which sometimes *Edward Boroughs*, and *Fr. Howgill*, two of their chiefs, uttered in the hearing of a credible witness now living in London) *That Christ was as really in every man, as he was in that flesh which suffered at Jerusalem*; And that according to that great mystery of Godliness, *1 Tim. 3. 16.* God was manifested in their flesh, and also of many others in our dayes. Doth not all this palpably tend to null and make voyd that one Messiah, and Mediator between God and man, the Man Christ Jesus who gave himself, &c.

Can

Can any man then (that is not wholly destitute of all true reason and light) believe, that these are such an Innocent and perfect people, (as they give out themselves to be) unless it be, that they are the more perfectly the Children of the evil one, than they were before they imbibed or drunk in these Errors? Yea, is not the Scripture, (which they so much undervalue) eminently verified in them, in being given up to the efficacy of delusions to believe lyes, &c.

And forasmuch as they abound with clamours, against the fundamental principles of Christianity, because of the weaknesses and imperfections which appear in many that profess the same; let it be admitted that such imperfections there are. Is there no way to witness against these than by abandoning Religion it self? Must Jesus Christ in his person and offices, and must the Holy Scriptures as the Rule be reprobated for the faults of them that pretend to them?

Can, or dare the *Quakers* say, there is nothing of imperfection and immortality amongst them? I am sure they are as guilty as any people whatever, then ought their way much more to be rejected for this very reason: whereto then doth their bitter Invectives against the Scriptures, and their contemptible and scornful speeches against the person of Christ without them tend, but to Irreligion and Atheism?

Yet that this their Error may not want some colour to give it a better complexion, their pretences to an infallible Spirit and Teacher within them, is of some use. Though of this they give us no other proof than their own words; and they will (Pope-like) be judge in their own case; and would have our faith resolved into the Authority of their lying pretences, What other import can be in those Dictates of that

Man of words, *W. Pen*, in the second part of the *Apolo-*
logy, pag. 138. *Methinks* (saith he) *This our de-*
monstration should satisfie all, (viz.) When neither
Man, nor Scriptures are near us, yet there continual-
ly attends us that Spirit that immediately informs
us of our words, thoughts and deeds; and gives us
true directions what to do, and what to leave undone.
 Were not this man transported with pride and error,
 beyond all bounds of modesty and sobriety, he could
 never imagine that these vain boasts of his should pass
 for a demonstration, especially since he hath bewrayed
 so much Arrogancy, Error, and bitterness of Spirit
 in that very Book, as may satisfie any mans reason
 to the contrary.

And though he is pleased to acquaint us. Pag. 119.
 120. *That it is their faith, that so glorious a vi-*
sion since the primitive days hath not happened to any,
as to us (Quakers) *in our day;* confessing their ap-
 pearance hath not been long, perhaps twenty years;
 whence he (boldly) concludes, *they are the Aposto-*
lick and Catholick Christians. But what if this faith
 be but a fancy, and this conclusion a meer self flat-
 tering delusion? For so I believe; yet since he is so pe-
 remptory to conclude thus: I would propose whether
 those persons the Papists call by the name of St.
Bridget, St. Katherine, Mother Juliana, St. Fran-
cis, and Ignatius Loyola, could not have said as much
 as all this amounts to, who under the pretence of in-
 spirations and visions, founded several orders and
 Sects in the Romish Church.

If the *Quakers* shall say the event proved these
 to be impostures; even so say I, hath their pretended
 visions and inspirations been palpably manifested to
 be no other than meer impostures and illusions,
 therefore

therefore we must have other demonstrations than *W. Pens* bare words, before we shall think our selves concerned to believe him: Notwithstanding he professeth, Pag. 82. That the Quakers have a measure of the same anointing the Apostles had: And that they are the men that have fulfilled the Evangelical teaching; (if you have fulfilled it, then there is no more teaching to be) Therefore do positively declare to all the world, that they are become the able ministers of the everlasting Gospels, to proclaim the acceptable day of the Lord: That as many as believe the universal grace, with which God hath endued them, and do obey the same, should have remission of sins, and eternal salvation.

But what if I doubt whether this be the Gospel which the Apostles preached; yet whether it be so or no, or whether the Quakers be such able ministers, (as he fondly dreams) I have no other demonstration either of the one or other than this; *W. Pen* professeth, and positively declares it is so, and so. Certainly he extreamly forgets himself, and thinks he hath only a Company of silly Quakers to deal with; with whom such confident Dictates are esteemed as Oracles. But I do appeal to any sober and judicious Person, whether there be any thing in these words of *W. Pen*, that looks like a demonstration?

If then *W. Pen* be so intoxicated with pride, and elevated in his own conceit of himself, as to conceive that as soon as he is pleased to signify his mind, in a few tinkling and ridiculous words, that we must presently fall down under the Authority thereof; I would therefore ask him, and that mostly in his Friend *Whiteheads* words; whether he thinks any ingenious Reader will thus be imposed upon, and abused,

as to believe such things, and receive them from the meer Say-so of such an Arrogant and conceited man.

Since then the world hath been sufficiently cheated and abused with pretenders of this kind : 'Twill be our wisdom to be deaf to the suggestions of these sort of men, who notwithstanding their own boasts, Do by their Meetings, writing Books, and esteeming only some amongst them to be of the Ministry, proclaim to the world the falshood and insufficiency of Mr. Pens pretended Demonstrations.

Let me then intreat the (*Reader*) to take heed thou be not frightened from the holy Scriptures by the clamorous outcries of this people against them, who are ready to say, *Is the Bible thy God? Is not the Light and Spirit more able to teach and instruct thee?* What is the meaning of these and such like Questions? But this, that the Spirit which Acts and Rules in the *Quakers*, is not the same which gave forth the Scriptures, unless we must suppose (which we dare not) that the Spirit is an Enemy to it self.

Therefore throw not off the *Rule*, which is the chief thing these deluded men design, that they may have you at their mercy to obtrude upon you every lying Fancy under the notion of some immediate Revelation, as many have had but two sad experience of.

'Tis accounted (and that justly) a wicked piece of policy in the Papists to keep people from the Scriptures, because should they be allowed to consult those sacred Records, they know their falshoods

hoods and cheats would soon be discovered and detected. Is there not much of this Devilish policy in the *Quakers* eager inveighing against the Scriptures, who that they may more effectually prevail, First, perswade us to throw aside this Sword of the Spirit, that we may not have wherewith either to defend our selves or offend them.

Furthermore when they shall ask (for 'tis a question frequently propounded by them) *Do you think to be saved by that Christ which dyed at Jerusalem, by that carnal blood which was shed there; of which (as one of them said) if thou hadst thy Apron full, what would it avail thee, and as another of them contemptuously, didst ever see any of the blood of Christ, or canst thou tell where any of it is?*

Oh let not such Blasphemy as this influence thee to the least disrespect to, or undervaluing thoughts either of that person or blood.

Though thou oughtest not to rest satisfied with meer general Notions of Christ and his sufferings; But by faith look at the special design, and intendment of that great undertaking of Jesus Christ as a Mediator, that thou mayst experience the effectual sprinklings and applications of the virtue of his blood upon thee.

But then beware lest under the pretence of this inward experimental knowledge; Thou oppose not what was done by Christ without thee. For as of old, it was not the living Bird, Hyssop, nor Scarlet wool that could heal the leper, but all these dipt in the blood of the dead bird, *Levit. 14. 6, 7.* Therefore acknowledge all that is sayingly wrought in thee,

thee, to be the application of the Fruit and Virtue of Christ dying for thee : Keep up then the Harmony between the work of Christ without thee, and the work of the Spirit within thee. For as what the Father did in the eternal Councils of his Will, was not to prevent or render useleſs the undertakings of Jeſus Chriſt as Mediator and Surety ; Nor what Chriſt hath done and ſuffered without us, was not to render the Spirit inſignificant, and of no uſe as to its workings in and upon the Souls of men : So neither can that which the Spirit doth in us, make void and of none effect the work of Chriſt without us. Since then there is ſuch a common conjunction and agreement between Father, Son and Spirit, in, and about this grand concern of our eternal welfare ; it cannot then be believed that the Spirits work in us is to degrade, but indeed to advance the Lord Chriſt both in his perſon and offices. Therefore ſaith Chriſt, *He ſhall glorifie me*, Joh. 16. 14.

Thus I have contributed my mite towards the detecting of this people, than whom no greater enemies (I believe) to the Chriſtian Religion ever ſprang up in the world, the native and direct tendency of their Tenents being to make void that one Saviour and Mediator Jeſus Chriſt, and conſequently to reduce us to meer Paganifme. A Religion (if I may ſo call it) oppoſing it ſelf to that eſtabliſhed way which God hath revealed in the holy Scriptures, for the bringing perſons to eternal life ; therefore it will concern us to take heed, that we be not (through their flattering inſinuation) beguil'd from the ſimplicity that is in Chriſt, endeavouring to have our judgments ſtabliſhed in thoſe principles which
are

are according unto godliness, that we may grow up into more acquaintance with, and conformity to the Lord Jesus. To this end let us be conversant with the Scriptures: Reverence its Authority, cherishing a sincere love to the whole truth therein revealed, maintaining a holy neglect of strange opinions, which gender nothing but strife, and puff up only with Air and Wind. By this means may we escape that snare, wherein Satan (by these poor deluded creatures) seeks to intrap us to our everlasting ruine. 2 Joh. 9. 10. 11, *Whosoever transgresseth and abideth not in the Doctrine of Christ hath not God. If there come any unto you, and bring not this Doctrine, receive him not into your house, neither bid him God speed: For he that biddeth him God-speed, is partaker of his evil deeds; seeing then you know these things, beware lest you being led away by the error of the wicked, fall from your own stedfastness, but grow in grace and in the knowledge of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. To him be glory both now and ever, Amen.*

IF the *Quakers* shall hereunto return that common answer, which they have alwayes ready at hand, (*viz*) That they are lyes and slanders, or that I am an envious and rayling Man. To the first, I shall not think my self concernd to give any reply; because I am fully satisfied in the truth of what is related concerning them. And secondly, it is no new thing with them to give the lye to another, though he repeat only their own words: For when they perceive any thing that hath dropped from them, may be improved to render them obnoxious to just censure; they will then strain courtesie, and boldly assume this liberty to fasten the lye upon it; which renders them to me a people miserably left, not only to believe, but to make lyes their refuge.

But whilst they solace themselves with such impertinent and unworthy replies: It would not be amiss for them to remember, that a Day is hastning wherein all the hidden things of dishonesty shall be made manifest, and brought to light: Then it shall be known whether these things be true or not.

In the mean time, since they are so bold and wicked, as to assert such perillous notions and fancies, yet I cannot see how it doth in any wise become them to be angry with me, or any other that shall endeavour to detect them; especially if it do and will appear, that my self and other, have herein acted according to that light *within* us. Therefore the *Quakers* would do well to take Wit in their anger, and consider seriously whether to censure or condemn me or others for thus doing, be not to pass judgment upon their own avowed principle; which is *that every man ought to obey the light within him*. Can an instance be produced of any person, or persons of known

know integrity, that ever perswaded others to that they accounted duty; That yet have stigmatized and loaded with reproaches, them who should so do.

"It is true indeed the Devil (that great Seducer and Accuser) doth prompt to many things, and afterwards upraid and accuse if those things to be done: whether then the *Quakers* do not herein imitate the Devil, and approve themselves exceeding vile and wicked: For either it is our duty to walk up to the light we have, or it is not? If not, why do the *Quakers* press it? If it be? Why do they judge and Condemn for it? But it may be they will say, it is not according to their light? That is nothing to me, I am not to do what the light in them, but what the light in my self directs me. And herein is my comfort; that what I have done in this matter, the light in me doth not reprove or condemn me for it.

To the other (*viz.*) that I am an envious and rayling Man: And why so? Truly I know no other reason then this: I told *G. W.* he was a Knave; wherefore I did then, and do still so esteem him; you have an account before. I would know of *G. W.* which of the two he reckons most Criminal: He that really is false and dishonest, or him that only puts him in mind what he is, And I would ask him, (since he looks upon this so great an affront) whether he did never at any time, (since he hath pretended to infallibility and perfection) let drop any words that have had the like import and significancy with this applied to him. But if he remember not, (for I know *Quakers* are very apt to forget their faults) that neither he himself, nor any of his approved friends were ever guilty in this kind, I shall for the help of his memory give him a few instances, though multitudes might easily be produced.

1. Doth not that *Quaker* who wrote that book called *the lying wonder*, pag. 9. endeavour to fasten these terms of Fool and Knave upon *J. G*?

2. Doth not *George Fox*, (their great prophet) in his *Mystery*, pag. 115. Call his opposers idle Fellows, with many other scurrillous terms?

3. Doth not *G. Whitehead* in his *Apology* pag. 1. represent *T. I.* as a malicious bungling Butcher, and in pag. 70. the Devils Lawyer, and in pag. 2. call *John Bunnyan*, *Bunnyan* the Tinker, an envious rayling man: Than which what can be a more scornful and invective speech? these streams sufficiently bewray the Fountain.

4. Doth not *W. Pen* that confident Dictator (in the second part of the aforesaid *Apology*, pag. 150.) Reply, O wretched Impudence, could any but a Priest, brazened with rage and folly, ever pronounce such a lye? When yet that to which *Pen* thus replies, is such a matter of Fact, that thousands can bare witness to the truth of it: Yea, *Pen* propounds the question, who hath reviled most, the *Quakers* or *T. I.* which implies that they have reviled, though he thinks not so much: If so? May not any indifferent and unbyassed person, conclude that *W. Pen*, (to uie his own words) is brazened with impudence, rage, and folly in thus answering; since it is so notorious, that not only raylings and revilings, but cursings have been the prime Arguments the *Quakers* have made use of.

Again, doth not this Man of words, pag. 156. (in justification of *Naylors* Blasphemy and raylings against such as opposed his Errors) tell us, that *had they* (meaning *Naylors* rayling words,) *been sent thousand times more sharp and significant against that cursed stock of Hirelings*, (as he is pleased to call some farr less deserving it, than *George Fox*, and

and many leading *Quakers*) they had been but enough, and I would say (saith *Pen*) not enough, but that the reverence I bear to the holy Spirit, doth oblige me to acquiesce in whatever he shall utter, through any prophet or servant of the Lord.

I propose these questions to consideration, from what *Pen* hath here expressed. 1. Whether he doth not intitle all *Naylors* Blasphemy and rayling, wherewith he was charged, upon the holy Spirit? 2. And whether he doth not openly confess, that *Naylor* was, and himself is, at a loss for words, fully to signify that venom and malignity of their hearts against their opposers? 3. Whether this may not be sufficient warning to all sober persons, to dread the opinions of the *Quakers*, since we see to what a height of rage, profaneness, and blasphemy, they do precipitate men into?

But it is more than probable, this self opinionated man, (together with other of his approved friends,) may think they have a dispensation to say any thing right or wrong against any that stand in their way. Throw dirt enough, (as a Politician said,) be sure some will stick, otherwise how can it be conceived that *W. Pen*, (a man pretending to so much reason) should have been so rash and inconsiderate, not only to whisper, but to print and publish it to the World, That the Presbyterians and Independents Breathe alwayes stinks of scurrility and persecution, pag. 150. in the aforesaid Apology; when yet it is beyond any just denial, that frequently they do exhort and perswade the people they speak unto, to believe in, and close with Jesus Christ as he is revealed, upon those terms the Gospel propounds it him: And that they give all diligence about those things that respect their eternal welfare

fare. That they live soberly, righteously, and godly, in this present evil world.

Can any man (that hath not first offered the greatest violence to his reason and light) believe that such breath as this is, stinks of scurrility. I do therefore appeal from *William-Pen* in his rage and fury, to himself in a composed temper of mind, whether this breath of his doth not stink, both of scurrility and wilfull lying.

To conclude, whether to call men Devils Serpents, Dogs, Beasts, Belly-Gods, Impudent Lyers, &c. Which kind of expressions do so much abound with this people, that it seems to be their natural Dialect. I quere whether such speeches as these, are unconcerned in the guilt of rayling and reviling: If not, whether it would not be more becoming the *Quakers* first, to pluck out the Beam that is in their own Eyes, before they quarrel with others for the Mote in theirs.

FINIS.
